

G746
2.M37
1914
Copy 1

W. P. C. Smith

MESSAGE
OF
GOVERNOR
COLE. L. BLEASE
TO THE
General Assembly
Of South Carolina

EXTRA SESSION
Commencing October 6th, 1914



S. C. STATE

MAY 10 1992

STATE DOCUMENTS

The R. L. Bryan Company
Columbia, S. C.
1914

MESSAGE
OF
GOVERNOR
COLE. L. BLEASE

TO THE
General Assembly
Of South Carolina

EXTRA SESSION
Commencing October 6th, 1914



The R. L. Bryan Company
Columbia, S. C.
1914

State of South Carolina.

Executive Chamber.

MESSAGE.

GENTLEMEN OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY:

I issued the following proclamation:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, }
Executive Chamber. } PROCLAMATION.

Whereas, It has been made to appear to me by representations of many citizens of the State and by resolutions of organized bodies, representing the cotton growers of this State, that a condition has arisen within the last few weeks whereby the price of cotton has declined to such an extent that it is impossible for this staple product of our State to be sold except at a ruinous loss, and that there is no way whereby any arrangements, or combinations, can be made to save the cotton growers from being absolutely sacrificed, and many of our citizens of this class will become penniless and without further means for the payment of their debts, planting of their crops and the support of their families; and further, that the financial condition of the country has become such that at present, and in all probability will continue to be such for sometime, that it is impossible to obtain credit on the security of their cotton, except at a ruinous and prohibitive rate, if at all; that this condition is widespread and throughout the entire cotton growing sections of the State; and it being made further to appear that it is impossible for the working classes of our citizens to obtain adequate means for the support of their families, dependent upon their labor, and that they are unable to borrow money on account of insufficient collateral or security, unless it be at a ruinous rate; that such condition of credit as exists and lack of confidence that there will be any improvement of affairs in the near future, which is creating despair among them; and it further appears that all classes of our citizens are affected by this condition, which prevails in the State, and possibly it appears throughout the whole country.

Many of the members of both branches of the General Assembly, and representatives of all classes of our citizens, have urged upon me that this state of affairs so existing is an extraordinary occasion,

demanding such State governmental relief as can be given by the General Assembly within the Constitution, and that the exercise of every legislative function should be brought into action to afford a remedy for their distress and to relieve our people, and especially should the State exercise its power of borrowing money to run the government, without demanding and exacting from the people taxes that have been levied for the present year, or for the next succeeding year, whereby all of our citizens, and especially our farmers and working men, should be afforded some relief.

In view of these representations, and of my own investigation into the condition of affairs, I now declare that such an extraordinary occasion exists in the State as requires and warrants the exercise of the constitutional power, vested in me, in convening the General Assembly in extra session to consider the present condition and state of our Commonwealth, and to pass such laws as it may, within the exercise of its legislative power, as will afford a remedy and relief to all citizens from the present situation, and which will probably continue for sometime.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, COLEMAN LIVINGSTON BLEASE, Governor of the State of South Carolina, in pursuance of the power conferred upon me by the Constitution of the State of South Carolina, and on account of the extraordinary occasion which has occurred, and which is contemplated by the Constitution of this State, Article IV, Section 16, do hereby convene the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina in extra session, at twelve o'clock m. on the sixth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, at the capitol, in the city of Columbia, for the consideration of matters hereinabove stated, and to pass such laws as in their good judgment may be necessary and proper for the relief of the citizens of our State.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State to be affixed, at Columbia, this tenth day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, and in the one
 [SEAL] hundred and thirty-ninth year of the independence of the United States of America.

(Signed) COLEMAN LIVINGSTON BLEASE,
 Governor.

BY THE GOVERNOR.

(Signed) R. M. McCOWN,
 Secretary of State.

In order that the reasons for this proclamation may be clearly set forth and well understood, and that the future citizens of this State may know the truth, and not be deceived and wilfully misled by such partial and unfair accounts as may be given to them by the newspaper writers of the day, I deem it essential for me to take more of your time than I had expected to take, in placing squarely and fairly before them, as well as before you, the true conditions now existing, and the true reasons which actuated me in issuing the proclamation above set forth.

On the 11th day of April, 1914, I delivered the following address at Walterboro, S. C.:

WALTERBORO SPEECH.

It is too fresh in the minds of the people of this State to need repeating here, but merely to keep the records straight, I desire to mention, that in the campaign of 1906, when I was a candidate for the office of Governor, I was fearfully, unjustly and maliciously assaulted by certain newspapers, tale-bearers and others, without cause or justification.

In 1908, you all remember the fearful onslaught that was made upon me by the editor of the *Columbia State* and other newspapers in South Carolina,—abuse, personal and political, falsehoods of the most unwarranted, malicious and foul character, which finally terminated in the cartooning of myself as a buzzard flying across the State with my face as its head, with its wings outspread and upon each of its feathers some dirty, filthy inscription.

Then again you remember how fearful this same contest was waged from the same source by this element of people, and, yea, these cowardly assassins of character have attempted to deceive the people outside of the State by continually yelling that it was Blease that was creating strife, that it was Blease that was carrying on a campaign of personal vituperation and abuse, when they knew, and all of the people of South Carolina knew, and know now, that I was discussing issues and doing all within my power to keep down factional strife, and no man can point to a speech that I have ever made which brought about, or would bring about, faction against faction, class against class, labor against capital, or *vice versa*.

Through it all I sat and said nothing. Many times friends would say to me, "we do not see how you can possibly stand it,—the vituperation and abuse,—which has been heaped upon you," and yet these people were endeavoring to bring others to believe that it was

I, and not them, that was engaging in a personal campaign instead of discussing issues. They knew they were lies. The people of this State know today that they were lies. They were not satisfied with these things, but even after I was nominated, yea, after I was elected and became Governor, this same crowd have continually kept up their nagging, their abuse, their vituperation, their slander, and even at the expense of lowering the people of this State in the estimation of the outside world, they have continued their malicious misrepresentations in reference to me, my official acts, and the Governor's office, and truly through it all I have been able to whip them, I have been successful, and will again in this campaign be successful, because the people are fair, they believe in a fair deal, and they will not sanction or tolerate, in this campaign, abuse and slander, as they have not tolerated it in the campaign of 1910 and 1912. And the other side might well remember the words of that Great Book: "Be not deceived, God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." They have sown falsehoods, vituperation and abuse; they have reaped defeat.

Two years ago, long before the opening of the regular campaign by the candidates for National and State offices, the newspapers began and carried on a campaign of abuse, vituperation and unfair criticism of the Governor of South Carolina. One of the Governor's opponents, as well as other speakers on that side, traveled the State from the mountains to the coast and heaped abuse upon the Governor and his followers. The Governor sat silent and took it all, without complaint or reply. When the opening day of the campaign came, in making his opening address, he referred not to this opponent or to these parties or their criticism, but again these sweeping criticisms and unfair and unjust charges, accompanied with vituperation and abuse, were indulged in. The next day the Governor answered them, fighting in defense of his personal character, his public reputation and his official acts. Since that time this abuse from newspapers and others has not ceased.

I had hoped that the people of South Carolina could this year witness a campaign pitched upon a high plane and fought upon high grounds—a campaign fought for principle, and not a campaign of personal abuse, vituperation and slander. It seems, however, that already the clamor has begun, and that another campaign is to be waged by my opponents based upon falsehood and abuse.

I am a Democrat, have always been, and have never on any occasion or at any time faltered in my allegiance to the Democratic

National and State platforms, and have always supported the nominees of the Democratic party, county, State and National, notwithstanding the fact that oftentimes I have voted for personal enemies—men to whom I did not speak, men to whom I do not yet speak, and men to whom I would not speak. I belong to the party to which my people have belonged for generations—to which I belonged in 1876, and have ever since, and for which I followed Hampton, Butler and Gary in 1876, when, although but a boy, I rode as a courier in the Red Shirt parades at Newberry, and obeyed, along with my people and your people, every call that was made upon us.

And the only time that my Democracy has yet been questioned, or is today being questioned, is by the editor of a newspaper who bolted the Democratic party and voted for an Independent against the regular Democratic nominees, both State and National—the editor of a newspaper that was born in independentism, was nursed in the cradle of an alliance of white people with negroes in an attempt to dethrone the Democratic party—a newspaper that from that day on, under the control of this editor, has been an upholder and a defender of the negroes as having rights on an equality with the white men, and has on every possible occasion condemned white men, by calling them murderers and outlaws and hoodlums, who have dared to stand in the open in the defense of the virtue of the white womanhood of our State—our mothers and sisters. That is the man, with his associates, with his independentism, with his record as a bolter and as aligning with negroes against white people, who dares to criticise my Democracy.

Before becoming a regular candidate for the United States Senate, I, as all other candidates, will take the following pledge provided by the Democratic party of this State:

“As a candidate for the office of United States Senator in the Democratic primary election, to be held on the last Tuesday in August, 1914, I hereby pledge myself to abide the results of such primary and support the nominees thereof, and I declare that I am a Democrat and that I am not, nor will I become, the candidate of any faction, either privately or publicly suggested, other than the regular Democratic nomination. I will support the political principles and policies of the Democratic party during the term of office for which I may be elected, and work in accord with my Democratic associates in Congress on all party questions.”

By that pledge we will be bound. If I am elected to the United States Senate, as I will be, I will support the platform and the prin-

ciples of the Democratic party, and when questions arise which are set out in that platform and in those announced principles I will unhesitatingly give them my support and my vote. Such questions as are not covered in that platform, and are independent of it, after giving them my most serious and careful consideration, I shall act upon as I believe to be for the best interests of the citizens of this nation, whom I will represent, and especially the people of South Carolina.

It has been charged, falsely, that I have criticised the President of the United States. That is known to be absolutely untrue. I was against Mr. Woodrow Wilson for the Democratic nomination, and in favor of another. But after he received his nomination, I not only voted for him myself, but wrote an appeal to my friends, who at that time were being most unfairly and unjustly treated by being charged with fraud in the State elections, and when the Bull Moose party was attempting to make inroads into the Democratic ranks in this State—I wrote this appeal to my friends and begged them to go to the polls and support the nominees of the National Democratic party, and to roll up a majority for our Congressmen as nominated, in order that no contest could be brought which might keep them from being seated if the Republican party controlled the National Congress. If the vote for me will be compared with the vote for Mr. Wilson, it will be shown that my friends and I were more loyal to the Democratic nominees than were the other side, because Mr. Wilson received more votes in this State than I received, and most assuredly any fool will admit that the Blease men did not vote for Wilson and at the same time neglect to vote for Blease. Therefore, it must have been the other side who went to the polls and voted for Wilson and violated their primary oath by declining to cast their votes for me as the Democratic nominee for Governor. The official figures are as follows: Vote for Democratic Electors, 48,357, except McMahan, who received 48,355. The vote for Blease, 44,122. Who swore falsely? And yet this dirty, mixed-breed editor is attempting, through the columns of his paper, to hold up to the people of this State that I am not in sympathy and accord with the National Democratic platform.

I am not running on Mr. Woodrow Wilson's coat-tails. I am not swinging on to the Cubans and mixed-breeds and other Haskellites, negro Deasites, and other aligners of 1890 and 1894 to be elected to the United States Senate from South Carolina. I was not a member of the Haskell convention. I stood out in the open and

supported Tillman and the regular Democratic nominees. I stood for the true Democratic principles then, as I stand today and as I stand in this campaign, and I am willing to compare records with those who are today attempting to criticise me.

I am sorry, my fellow citizens, to have to refer to these matters here today, but you see the trend that some people are taking and the effort that they are making endeavoring to show that I should not be elected to the United States Senate because of the fact that I was not a supporter of Mr. Wilson for the Democratic nomination. They forget, possibly, that no man ever had a more bitter enemy in the political world than Ben Tillman was to Grover Cleveland, and that was not used to defeat him for the Senate. Surely also the people have not forgotten that after Mr. Tillman was Senator, that his abuse of Mr. President Cleveland was fearful. Yet nobody, so far as I can remember, held Mr. Tillman up and said that he should be defeated because of this, because Mr. Tillman was standing by the Democratic platform and the Democratic party as he saw it, and Mr. Cleveland was not, as Mr. Tillman saw it.

So far as I am concerned, I am not swinging on to anybody's coat-tails.

In 1890 I was a reformer, but I did not run on the coat-tail of any man. In fact, I had run for the Legislature in Newberry county in 1888, and received a majority of the votes cast. However, there were three who received a higher vote than myself, and as there were only three places in the Legislature I had to wait until 1890, when I was elected by a handsome majority. In 1894, I declined, as a candidate for the Legislature, to pledge myself to the then Governor B. R. Tillman or then Senator M. C. Butler, for a seat in the United States Senate, because I believed in running on my own merits and not upon the coat-tails of any man. As a candidate for Governor I refused to tie myself to the coat-tails of any man. I have ever refused to do so. I recognize no political boss, so far as my actions in this world are concerned, except the people, whose servant I am, and to whom I answer, and to whom I answer for all my public acts. As to my personal acts, as to my morality and my private life, I believe that there is a God; I love Him, I honor Him, and to Him will I answer, and upon Him I depend for my health, my strength, my success in this world, and for a reward in the world to come. And I do not propose to makè this campaign hanging upon the coat-tails of any man, but standing firmly and squarely as a Democrat—as a Jeffersonian Democrat.

In this connection, I do not care to refer to anything unpleasant, but it should be remembered that Mr. Bryan, the present Secretary of State of the United States under President Wilson, bolted the Democratic ticket in Nebraska in 1910 or 1911. None of these papers that are now raising this howl are now accusing him of being an Independent or of not being a Democrat. On the contrary, they followed his lead in the Baltimore convention.

To show you the utter inconsistency of this sheet which now attempts to criticise me and to read me out of the Democratic party because I was not a Wilson man for the nomination, in their issue of April 6th, 1914, in speaking of the candidacy of Mr. Underwood for the United States Senate, they say:

"Within the last week Underwood has done a thing that, under the circumstances, proves his quality and temper to our mind better than anything he has done in a long while, and he has done many notable things. He opposed the repeal of the toll exemption Act, thereby aligning himself for the moment against the administration that he has magnificently served."

Hence, you see, when it suits them in defense of their man, it is all right for him to fight against the administration, or do anything else he wants to do, but on the other hand, with their usual inconsistency, no matter what their opponent does, he does wrong.

I invite a comparison of my record as a Democrat and as one who has always been true to the Democratic party with the record of any other man in the party.

It is true that Mr. Wilson, under certain recommendations from our State, has seen fit so far not to give a single public office to a "Bleaseite," as some call them. Every office that he has given in South Carolina has been to men who were against me and my friends, and in some instances he has given them to men who have voted against the Democratic nominees. I have not complained. If my friends have asked for anything I do not know it, and most assuredly I have not asked for anything for any of them, and I only mention this to show you that Mr. Wilson, either himself or through his advisers in this State, has absolutely ignored the present Governor of South Carolina and his followers, and instead of treating them with fairness and any consideration at all, he has turned as deaf ear to them as he could have turned if they had been bolters.

In order to show you more fully the kind of people who are questioning my Democracy, I desire to call your attention not only to the editor, but to the owners and managers of this daily newspaper in

Columbia that is holding itself up as the great guardian of South Carolina's Democracy and as the censor of the Democratic party. I quote from a statement in the paper itself :

"Managing Editor—W. W. Ball"—Independent and Haskellite.

"Publisher and General Manager—Ambrose E. Gonzales"—Independent, Haskellite.

"Owners—Ambrose E. Gonzales"—already designated ; "estate of N. G. Gonzales," Independent and Haskellite, reporter who reported Haskell convention, copy of which report I now have in my possession ; "William E. Gonzales," Independent, Haskellite, and, as I have heretofore stated, a chicken that has gone back home to roost, one who has gone back to Cuba, the present minister to Cuba ; "Wm. H. Lyles," Independent and Secretary to the Haskell convention, who bolted the Democratic nominees and supported Independents, one of those of all of whom General Wade Hampton said—copy of which statement I have—"An Independent is worse than a Radical." Later General Hampton reiterated this in an article on Governor Tillman, which was printed in this newspaper to which I have referred, and was headed, "Hampton Hits Him Hard," copy of which article I now have. This latter "owner" is also one of the Trustees of Benedict College, in Columbia, a negro college, which has white women in it teaching negroes and associating with negro men. These are the "owners" of this Independent sheet that now sets itself up, as I have stated, as the guardian of the South Carolina Democracy—these Independents, of whom Hampton said "they are worse than Radicals"—and Hampton was the "noblest Roman of them all."

And since this paper and its editor—and I beg right here to call your attention to the fact that what a newspaper says is not what the people of the State say or what the people of the county say, or even what the people of the community say, but what one man, its editor, says, and your opinion to you certainly must be better than his is to you—now, since this paper is continuously bawling about supporting nominees and about upholding the hands of the President, what about them? Have they ever supported me, as a Democratic nominee for Governor? Have they ever spoken a pleasant word of me or my administration? Have they ever done one thing to uphold my hands as Governor, and for the best interests of the people of this State? No. They have misrepresented me; they have failed to support me; they have abused me; they have lied on me, and all this talk is slush, to try to fool my friends and deceive

them. However, it will not go. The people will not be deceived. They were not in 1910, nor in 1912, and they will not be in 1914. Do you remember how the reports of the papers gave everything to the other side? The greatest speeches were made by the speakers on the other side; the speakers on the other side received all the applause; two-thirds of the crowd at every meeting almost were "against Blease." It was all false. It was done to deceive those who were not present. But when the primaries were held each year their reports were proven false by the voters, who rolled up the majority for me and my friends, as they will do again this year, the newspaper misrepresentations and falsehoods to the contrary notwithstanding.

The platform of the Farmers' Movement, held in March, 1890, in Section 11, stated: "Believing with Thomas Jefferson that the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason is a fundamental principle of free government, and it will give the needed relief, we demand that candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall, and all other aspirants to State offices are invited to canvass the State," etc. In the same year the August convention, in the constitution of the Democratic party inserted Article 11: "Before the election in 1912, and each election year thereafter, the State Democratic Executive Committee shall issue a call to all candidates for State offices to address the people of the different counties of the State, fixing the dates for the meetings," etc.

I still favor that, and I go further and favor that candidates for the United States Senate, as included in the amended constitution of the Democratic party, also go face to face before the people of this State. The effort to abolish the county-to-county canvass is made by the newspaper editors, who hope to keep the truth from the voters and force the people to accept the newspaper accounts of what is being said and done by the candidates, and thus, by lies and abuse, deceive the voters in favor of the newspaper favorites and against those whom they oppose.

Allow me to announce the principle that should be the platform of the candidates this summer:

1st. An honest administration of all laws, fairly and impartially to all citizens alike.

2d. Enforcing all laws upon all subjects, and obedience to the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of South Carolina.

3d. Keeping forever separate the Legislative, Judicial and Executive Departments of the government, each, however, doing its duty and endeavoring to uphold and support the other.

4th. Trial by jury for all persons accused of crime, and enforcing the judgments of Courts founded upon the verdicts of the juries.

If you should allow me further to suggest, I would make the following issues :

First. Competency.

Second. Honesty of purpose.

Third. Education.

Fourth. Taxation.

Fifth. The Fortner Bill, or a similar measure that will prevent white people from teaching negroes in any school or college in this State.

Sixth. A flat rate of two cents per mile on all railroads in South Carolina.

Let each candidate when he appears before the voters show himself competent and honest and declare himself upon the other issues which I name. Then, after he expresses himself, if the voter finds him competent and honest, and he stands upon these issues as the voter stands, let the voter support him. If he does not, defeat him. As for myself, I will answer now ; while time will not permit me to answer fully, I will give my position :

First. Competency.

As to my competency, my experience in the House and Senate, and my reputation as a parliamentarian in those bodies, speak for themselves, and I respectfully submit, show me thoroughly competent to be a member of any lawmaking body in this nation.

Second. Honesty of purpose in doing those things which the candidate pledges himself to do, and being certain that he favors those things which are for the best interests of the people—that he favors them at heart and is not simply claiming to favor them for the purpose of being elected.

As to my honesty, I submit the public records in various offices which I have held since 1890.

Third. Education.

As to education, my record is so well known that I feel as if it is wasting time to reiterate it. I have done more for the country schools of this State than any other man who has ever held office in it. My fight for an extra one-mill levy is well known, and fresh in the minds of the people. My fight in the last Legislature, and the

result of bringing about a very large appropriation for all common school purposes, marks this administration as having done more for the educational interests of South Carolina than any administration heretofore. I think all leading educators will admit this fact, though some of them, of course, through narrow-mindedness and prejudice will attempt to take some of the credit from me. However, the record speaks for itself and the country schools of this State, under the appropriation of 1914, will receive more assistance than they have ever received before, and if the money is spent properly they will be in the best condition they have ever been in.

If this policy is kept up it will be only a short while until there will not be any cry for compulsory education. The people want opportunity, and not compulsion, and if the proper kind of schools are located convenient to the people, and run properly and for the proper length of time, all of the children of this country will go to school and be educated, compulsion will not be necessary, and it will not be essential, in order to give the children an education, to take from the control of the parents their children and place them in the hands of some one who is highly educated in books, but whom God in some way, and for some wise reason, has woefully neglected in supplying common sense to.

Of course I am opposed to compulsory education, and so is every other man who is a true Democrat and who believes in the God-given right of letting all people control their own children. I have never yet seen or heard a respectable or common sense argument in favor of compulsory education. It comes from those who expect to receive higher salaries by it, or to be financially benefited, or else from some narrow-minded bigot who has made a failure in raising his own children and whose children have brought shame to his face in many instances, and now wants to attempt to raise somebody else's.

Of course there are some good people who are in favor of compulsory education, but they are being misled and misguided, and if the opportunity were given them to hear the matter impartially and fairly discussed, it would not be long before they would be found on the side of Democracy, and opposing this outrageous system.

3½. Let every mother control her own children in her own way, as God intended, and let her be free from outside interference and meddling.

Fourth. Taxation.

My views on this subject are so well known that it is hardly necessary to say more than I favor a lower State and county levy, and a more economical administration of the affairs of our State.

Fifth. The Fortner Bill, or a similar measure, that will prevent white people from teaching negroes in any school or college of this State.

Of course I favor the Fortner Bill, and I have presented my reason therefor fully in the past, and shall do so in the future.

Sixth. A flat rate of two cents per mile on all railroads in South Carolina.

I have always favored that, as my record in the House and in the Senate, and as Governor, will show.

I have saved the State several times my salary each year during my administration. I have done this in various ways. I have returned each year into the State treasury from the contingent fund of the Governor's office and from law and order fund a large part of the \$10,000 appropriated for these purposes, practicing close economy in the handling of the affairs of the office. I have saved the State many thousands of dollars in my handling of requisitions, and in refusing to offer useless rewards, and by the revoking of all commissions of notaries public, I rid the State of many negro officials, and at the same time have placed into the State treasury about \$10,000. Recently I discovered that a negro was holding an office as a member of the Board of School Trustees in Beaufort. I called by wire a meeting of the State Board of Education, a resolution was passed demanding that he be turned out, and we got rid of him. If there is any negro now holding office in South Carolina, other than under the United States government, I don't know it, and if I were in the United States Senate I would make a hard fight to have the United States government give these positions that are now held in this State by negroes to our white people.

In addition to these matters, I have saved the State thousand of dollars by my veto of extravagant appropriations. At the last session of the General Assembly I sent the following veto message on appropriations:

MESSAGE NO. 59.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER.

Gentlemen of the House of Representatives:

I herewith return to you without my signature, House Bill No. 1405 (Senate No. 1066), Act No. 334, General Appropriation Bill, 1914.

I do not veto the entire Act, but in a good many instances to sign it would be inconsistent with my pledges to the people of the State, and, therefore, while I do not disapprove of all the items of the Bill, I mention specifically herein those which I disapprove.

It is currently rumored, in fact, I have received it as coming from the body itself, that some Senators agreed among themselves that the Bill as it came from the House was very large, and that, judging him by his past record, the Governor would veto many of the items therein, and that it was best for the Senate to cut out of the Bill all it possibly could, even if some Senators had to vote against things that they favored, in order to make it appear that the Senate had saved the taxpayers thousands of dollars, thereby not giving to the Governor the opportunity to be sustained in his vetoes and have him and his party given the credit of the reduction.

I am glad that that part of the Senate has learned a lesson, and I am satisfied that the people of this State will approve of their wisdom in this course which they have taken, even though it should take a "temporary political play," as one of them described it, from the Governor. The Governor is perfectly satisfied if the people are saved the money during his administration, whether it be done by the House or by the Senate, by his friends or his opponents. His first idea is the interest and benefits of the people of his State. However, if you will notice the Senate votes, you will find that if it had not been for the Governor's friends in that body, many of these items would not have been cut out.

Thanks to the Senate!

The Governor's only regret is that they did not learn this lesson three years earlier.

I have requested the General Assembly, at each session since I have been Governor, to itemize all of their appropriations, and not to put small items together, and make a large lump sum, without a proper explanation of what the individual items are. Particularly have I requested this in regard to the appropriations for your higher institutions of learning, because, as I have pointed out, under the head of "maintenance," for instance, so many thousand dollars is placed, and if I should veto that item, and you sustain that veto, it might cause serious injury to that particular institution. But if you were to do as I have asked you to do—make these items separate—then I could veto individual items, and to sustain those vetoes would not injure the institution, and at the same time would protect the people from this excessive taxation. I wish it were so—and I think

the constitutional convention made a mistake when it failed so to provide—that the Governor should have the power to reduce particular items. For instance, when you say, “for maintenance, \$100,000,” the power should be given to the executive instead of vetoing that to say, “reduce ‘for maintenance’ from \$1,000 to, say, to illustrate, \$75,000.” This would prevent the annual hue and cry which is made, “If you sustain this veto you injure the institution.” If it were in my power to exercise this discretion I could, without injury to any institution in the State, or any department of the State government, save the people on this appropriation Bill many thousands of dollars. And when I requested of you to itemize these appropriations I knew what I was doing. Those of you who now have been caught in this trap will have to answer to your people, and if some of you are not careful, the people are going to say you were weighed in the balance and found wanting.

Many of you pledged on the stump to reduce taxes. You stood up before the people and said you were against the creation of useless offices; that you were against the raising of the tax levy; that you were in favor of cutting down expenses. The people took your word for it, and they elected you to the General Assembly. Now, what have you done?

First, look at your county levy. Have you raised the salaries of any of your county officers? Have you increased the expenses of your county government? Have you increased your county levy?

Second, look at the State levy. Are you turning out an increased appropriation Bill, or have you reduced the appropriation Bill? Are you giving higher institutions of learning and your State departments more money or less money? Is your State levy higher or lower than it was before? Add your State levy to your individual county levy and ask yourselves the question, have I kept my promises made to the people at the county campaign meetings in 1912? If your answer is “no,” then ask yourselves the question, “How am I going to account to my people for this increased county levy and this increased State levy?”

Fortunately for you, the Governor is vetoing some of this Bill, and you have yet the opportunity to save yourselves with your people and redeem your pledges.

Now, listen:

Where are the advocates of these higher appropriations, who appear before your committees, going to be in the campaign this summer? Are they going before your people, as they did before

your committee, and advocate your re-election? Are they themselves going to vote for you? Or is it a case of "get all we can out of them now; to political oblivion with them hereafter?" Those of you who expect to run for higher offices will certainly have these things put up to you all over the State. Those of you who are going to run for re-election have certainly got men at home now watching you who want your jobs, and the fact that you have raised this tax levy so fearfully high, and the fact that you have passed such an extravagant appropriation Bill, is going to be put right square up to you, and some of you are going to find that, instead of coming to Columbia next January, you will be performing your regular routine duties at home. You may say that you do not care. If you do not, it is all right, so far as the future is concerned, but you certainly ought to care for your reputation and protect the promises which you have already made.

I say these things in all kindness.

You have had a very pleasant session, of which no one is prouder than I am. And I hope good will and peace will forever prevail among all our people. But it is not going to prevail so long as you burden the people with taxation as you are now doing.

I decline to approve of the item of Section 12, which provides that the State Librarian is required to turn over to the State Treasurer all money now in possession and all funds hereafter received by her once a month as all State officers are required. This provision has never been inserted in a Bill before. Your body elected the present little lady, who now holds the job, and it looks like a reflection upon her to require her to make a monthly report, when no one in that position has ever been required to do so before, and, knowing her pleasantly, for the past three years, and watching her in discharge of her duties in the Adjutant General's office, I cannot be a party to this item which I consider a reflection upon her. If it had been in the Bill heretofore, I would have nothing to say, but to stick it in now looks like it might be a reflection upon her honesty, and I will not be party to do it.

I disapprove of Item 14, Section 13.

The Bill which this item was inserted to meet, to place meters in the public institutions and residences, proves to be a nonentity, in that the title of the Bill does not conform to the body, inasmuch as the body of the Bill only provides for public institutions, thus defeating the purpose of the Bill; this \$3,000 will not be needed this year.

I disapprove of Item 16, Section 13, repairing heating plant at the Governor's Mansion. The heating plant there is not in the best condition, but we can get along with it for the remainder of the time we are there and we really do not care to have it torn up at present.

(Repairing heating plant, \$1,000.)

I disapprove of Item 8, Section 15. This is a useless expense, and the financial condition of our State can wait for 12 months and the State and the Commissioner of Agriculture will neither be injured.

(Preparation and printing State Hand Book, \$2,500.)

I disapprove of Item 1, Section 18. I think this matter could properly be taken care of under the extraordinary appropriations given to the Health Department.

(Board of Medical Examiners, for expenses, salaries, etc., \$3,000.)

I disapprove of Item 5, Section 19 (for books and blanks, investigation and installation of system of bookkeeping and examination of financial condition of counties, tax department, \$4,000). The Comptroller General is paid a salary, and he has a clerk and assistants who are also paid salaries, for performing this very work. It is put under a different head as a subterfuge. If you will examine into who is receiving this money, you will find people getting it who are being paid double salaries, in direct violation of the Constitution of this State.

I disapprove of the proviso in Section 20, which provides as follows:

"Provided, That the Board of Trustees of the University of South Carolina be empowered to permit the erection on the grounds of the University, under such restrictions as they may deem wise, a building to be used as a free public library." I disapprove of this item, because in a conference it was decided it was an unwise proviso at the present time.

I disapprove of Item 8, of Section 24 (for building hospital—State Colored Industrial and Mechanical College—\$5,000), because I do not believe such a building to be necessary at this time.

I disapprove of Item 12, of Section 26 (farms at State Park, \$7,500). The farms at State Park should be self-sustaining. You must remember that many of the insane people are worked on these State farms, and they make good farm hands. In addition to that, there are many acres of land there, and last year the Hospital Commission and the Board of Regents, in their reports, bragged on what

good crops were made—about how much corn was grown and how much cotton—and yet they come now and ask for \$15,000 to sustain those farms. I do not think that a cent should be given, but I think that these farms should be made self-supporting, particularly when they have free labor.

I disapprove of Item 3, Section 30.

The Old Soldiers' Home is now being well managed and the inmates are well satisfied. You have a Board of Commissioners, composed of as good men as South Carolina ever has had or ever will have, and nothing but political spite and little cheap intrigues, on the part of some people, has created all of the stir that has gone on there. I think you would make a mistake, gentlemen, a serious mistake, to interfere with this Board, and I certainly do not think you should. You had a Bill to change the management of this Home, and the manner of appointment of the Board, and it was overwhelmingly defeated by your body, and I cannot understand why a change in the management should now try to be slipped in the appropriation Bill. It is simply another case of legislation in the appropriation and supply Bill which is getting entirely too common for your bodies.

I respectfully disapprove of the entire Section 31 (Historical Commission), and I disapprove specifically of Item 1, Item 2, Item 3, Item 4, Item 5, under this section. Therefore, I disapprove of each item separately. I also disapprove of the entire section, and my reasons apply to the section as a whole and to each item separately. I do not believe that this Commission is legally constituted, under the Constitution and statute laws of our State, and I believe that any appropriation you would make to it, as at present constituted, is unconstitutional, and that by an injunction this Commission, or any of its officers or employees, could be stopped from drawing every dollar of any appropriation which might be made for it. In addition, I do not believe that this Commission is recording a fair and truthful history of our State. Those of you members of the General Assembly who are friends of mine, if you desire to be written in the history of this State as anarchists, as blackguards, as thieves in primary election matters, as favoring illiteracy in the State and as being opposed to honest government, you vote to pass this section over my veto, for I am satisfied this is the manner in which my friends and myself will be written in the history of South Carolina by the present Historical Commission. No matter what attainments may be ours, no matter what historic things we may do,

the truth in regard to us and what we do will never be recorded by this Commission.

I hope that I speak plainly. This Commission as now constituted is clearly unconstitutional, and has no power, except such as they take without authority of law. I want the world to know that I am against this crowd, and that they are against me, and that what they write about me and my friends will be prejudiced against us, and I want it to be known by coming generations, when they read the history written by this crowd about me and my friends, that they were my enemies.

I disapprove Item 5 of Section 32 (interest likely to accrue, under head of "Interest on Bonded Debt," \$2,000). I have disapproved of a similar item every year since I have been Governor, and so far I have never seen any necessity for it, and in my opinion it is \$2,000 simply set aside for some people to get their hands on if the opportunity is offered.

I disapprove of Item 3 of Section 39. I have stated to you gentlemen in my general message, and in special messages, that I would not sign any bond under your Act of 1912. You have seen fit to make no changes in this refunding Act during your session, and I want to guarantee you right now that I do not propose to sign any such bond. Therefore, this \$25,000 is absolutely useless and an uncalled-for appropriation, and if you put it on the people it will simply be an outrage.

(Sinking Fund for bonded debt under Act of 1912, \$25,000.)

I disapprove of Item 4 of Section 39. I have been Governor a little over three years, and have never heard of any Phosphate Commission, although I am told I am chairman of it. I don't know whose pocket this is going into, but if anybody is getting it he is getting it wrongfully, and, as Uncle Josh would say, "I am agin' it."

(Phosphate Commission, \$300.)

I disapprove of Item 9 of Section 39. I do not see any use to be paying committees to examine lawyers when the Supreme Court is having lawyers before it every few days for disbarment. I think we would do better to go back to where we were a few years ago, and then maybe we wouldn't have so much partiality.

(State Board of Law Examiners, \$450.)

I disapprove of Items 14 and 15 of Section 39. The Constitution provides that the State's money shall not be given to private purposes. You may vote for it, and put a mental reservation on your vote, but I cannot put it on mine.

(State Plant Breeders' Association, to be paid through E. J. Watson, \$1,500. Live Stock Association, to be paid through J. M. Burgess, Secretary and Treasurer of Clemson College, \$1,000.)

I disapprove of Item 16, of Section 39. I am reliably informed that there is another bank building in the city of Columbia which offered the committee a better proposition than this, and that it was declined, or at least, was not properly considered; and I am also informed that the State can get 1,300 more feet of space for \$500 less. I do not charge that this is true, but I consider this \$4,000 unnecessary, as we have plenty of offices if they are properly utilized. Therefore, I cannot approve of this item.

(Rent of 22 rooms for State offices in Union National Bank Building, \$4,000.)

I disapprove of Item 17 of Section 39 (South Carolina Agricultural Society, \$5,000), for the same reasons that I have disapproved of this appropriation each year since I have been Governor—that the Constitution of this State says that you shall not appropriate public funds for private purposes. I would violate my constitutional oath by approving this item, and, therefore, I will not consent to it.

I herewith insert extracts from Hon. J. A. Banks' address to the members of the Fair Association, as reported in the *Columbia State* of February 19, 1914:

"My friends of the State Agricultural and Mechanical Society, in retiring from the office of President of your society it is my desire to give a brief review of its history during the three years of my administration.

"Outstanding notes of \$12,000 indorsed individually by members of your Executive Committee have been retired.

"A steel auditorium, costing \$33,000, has been erected in which was held a National Corn Show in the winter of 1912 and 1913.

"A new constitution has been adopted which simplifies and renders more businesslike all of the affairs of the society.

"The city of Columbia is paying one-half of the interest on our bonds outstanding.

"The Treasurer reports \$1,900 cash in the bank."

I also quote financial report of the Fair Association, clipped from the same newspaper:

ASSETS.

Real estate	\$ 15,000 00
Treasury bonds	33,000 00
New grounds and buildings.....	80,723 11
Race track	2,934 89
D. G. Ellison, Treasurer.....	1,953 30
J. M. Cantey, Secretary.....	7 84
Suspense account	56 85
	<hr/>
	\$133,675 99

LIABILITIES.

Bills payable	\$ 29,500 00
Bonds outstanding	33,000 00
Warrants outstanding	709 72
	<hr/>
	\$63,209 72
Net surplus	\$70,466 27
Net surplus, 1912.....	\$64,844 49
Profit, 1913	5,621 78
	<hr/>
	\$70,466 27

You will notice by this that this society is no longer a beggar. She has a net surplus of \$70,466.27, and I call your particular attention to the fact that outstanding notes of \$12,000 endorsed individually by members of the Executive Committee have been retired. These are the words of President Banks. A steel auditorium worth \$30,000 has been put up. The Treasurer reports \$1,900 cash in bank.

Now, gentlemen, with this kind of showing, I ask you once again why you should take the money out of the individual taxpayer's pocket when he is already so heavily burdened, to make a present of it to an association that shows that it has a surplus of over \$70,000? Can you conscientiously do it? I am a member of this association—a life member—and I do not wish to see it injured, but I am Governor, and my first duty is to my people.

I disapprove of Item 27, of Section 39 (for State Negro Fair, \$1,000). The Constitution of this State says that you shall not appropriate public funds for private purposes, and I would violate my oath of office by consenting to this appropriation; therefore I cannot consent to it.

I disapprove of Item 30 of Section 39, for the same reason that I disapprove of Items 14, 15, 17 and 27.

(South Carolina Poultry Association, \$1,200.)

I disapprove of Item 32, Section 39. It is absolutely a useless and unnecessary expense, and the committee has not performed its duties which it was appointed to perform, and therefore is not entitled to any pay, nor are any of those who served upon it.

(Expenses Asylum Investigating Committee, \$521.70.)

I disapprove of Item 34, Section 39. The item here reads "McKie Merriweather." In the Bill it reads "Mackey Merriweather." The Acts read "Hamberg," when it should read "Hamberg."

(For monument to McKie Merriweather as provided by Act of 1914, \$400.)

I disapprove of Section 41: "That in anticipation of the taxes hereinbefore levied, the Governor and the State Treasurer and the Comptroller General be, and they are hereby, empowered to borrow on credit of the State so much money from time to time as may be needed to meet promptly, at maturity, the interest which will mature on the first day of July and on the first day of January of each year, on the valid debt of the State, and to pay the current expenses of the State government for the present fiscal year, and for pensions: *Provided*, The sum so borrowed shall not exceed the sum of six hundred thousand (\$600,000) dollars." You gentlemen know the feeling which exists between the Governor and the State Treasurer and the Comptroller General. You are aware of the trouble that was experienced in 1913 in reference to this matter, and I again ask you not to place me in the same position, and I appeal to my friends to sustain me in this veto.

This Bill was sent to the Governor's office, and receipted for by the Governor's Secretary last night, and it could have easily been returned to your body last night; but, two errors were found in the Bill, and it had to be recalled and corrected this morning. The Bill was returned to the Governor's office and receipted for by the Governor's Secretary at 11:40 a. m. and is now, at 12:25, returned to you, which places it in the Governor's hands much less than one hour—after your bodies, the House and the Senate, have been working on it for eight weeks. Who has caused the delay in adjournment of the General Assembly? Who has prolonged your session, —certainly not the Governor. Very respectfully,

COLE. L. BLEASE, Governor.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Senate had played politics, I saved the State by my veto \$63,000. And truly the University of South Carolina, Winthrop College, and the Reformatory at Florence, can say:

"I was wounded in the house of my friends."

Because the House of Representatives had given them the new buildings that were asked for by each, but the Senate, in order to play cheap politics, as they did, deprived these schools of their buildings. And I am proud to know that the trustees of these institutions know the source from which they were struck. It is not a question of "who struck Billy Patterson," for each institution knows who struck it. It was the Senate that struck the blow.

I am sorry to have taken so much of your time, but I find that on account of the fact that I cannot get in the newspapers of this State, except that I pay for it, matters which I desire to talk to the people of South Carolina about, and being a poor man and unable to pay the extravagant prices charged, it is necessary for me, when I can reach the people, to try to do so fully. I have only given you an outline of the various matters here today, but as I go over the State I will take up more fully and discuss the various issues which I have laid down.

The election of a Legislature is a very important matter and you should ask each candidate for the House of Representatives and the Senate the question how he will vote on these various issues. Ask him particularly what he will do in reference to preventing white people from teaching negroes, and if he says he will not vote for a Bill to stop it, you beat him. Ask him particularly how he stands on the two-cent rate Bill, and incidentally you might ask him if he is a railroad attorney, if he travels on a railroad pass, and what he pays for it with, and if he is a candidate for re-election you might consistently ask him how he voted on the two-cent rate Bill at the last session, and what influenced his vote.

The election of Governor is of particular importance at this time. I do not know that it is necessary for me to state here what I am going to say, but for fear that my position may not be understood fully, and to keep it from being misunderstood by any one, I wish to say that I do not propose to take any part in the Gubernatorial election, as between friends of mine. In other words, I do not propose to endeavor to dictate to the people of this State whom they shall elect as Governor. I do not propose to suggest even to my friends and supporters whom they should support. Of course, however, I

am going to support and vote for a man who is my friend, and who represents the principles that I do, and I expect my friends and supporters to do the same thing. In the first primary I shall be "hands-off." However, in the second primary, if that second primary is between two friends and supporters of mine, I shall still take no part, but if it is between one of my friends and an enemy or opponent of mine and the issues which I represent, I shall do everything within my power, and use all of the power that I have, to elect that man who stands for the principles which I represent, and who is my friend, for by representing these principles he proves himself to be the friend of the people of my State, and should be elected Governor.

Those of you who believe in a government of the people, by the people and for the people, should vote only for a man who will carry out the principles and policies which the majority of the people of this State endorsed by re-electing me in 1912. This is no small matter, because all of my friends will be kicked out of office if the opposition wins. They will treat you just exactly as if you were Republicans, or as if you belonged to some other party. Mark the prediction. If an anti-Blease man is elected Governor of South Carolina, every Blease officeholder in the State, whether he be high official or low, whether he hold a salaried position or an honorary position, as soon as the time comes he will be dismissed and one of the other faction placed in his stead. I have set a precedent in appointments, and I refused to appoint any man upon the recommendation of any man or set of men (delegates in the Legislature or otherwise) unless the man appointed was acceptable to me. The only exceptions in this have been in cases where the law made it so that I had no discretion in the matter.

I did not coin the word "Bleaseite." In 1890, when the State was dividing itself into Tillmanites and anti-Tillmanites, I refused then to be tagged as either, although I was a reformer, because I believed that the State of South Carolina was too great, and her people are too honorable, to be divided off as the followers or the not followers of any one man. And I had never hoped to live to see that day when the great Palmetto State, with her glorious history, and her gallant and chivalrous men and noble women, would be divided into "Bleaseites" and "anti-Bleaseites." It is an honor to me which I never expected—a word which was coined and a condition which was brought about by my enemies. Indeed I thank them for the

honor, but I am not yet foolish enough to feel that the people as a whole are complimented by such designations.

I say, and I repeat, no man has ever had such friends as I have had. Such loyalty, such devotion, such admiration, and such love as have been shown to me and poured out upon me by my friends have never been equalled in the annals of all the world. I have learned things—many things—that it seemed to the world it was impossible for anybody to know, except the chosen few. It has not been done by purchase nor has it been done by deceit. It has been brought to me by devoted friends—men and women who loved me and admired my course, and who knew that I was fighting for the best interests of all the people of my State. That fight, I shall continue. That fight, whether I live or die, I beg my friends to carry on, writing upon their banners,

“On to victory, victory for freedom, victory for liberty, victory for humanity, and, above all, victory for Christianity, for mercy and for God.”

ST. MATTHEWS SPEECH.

Thereafter I delivered the following address at St. Matthews, S. C., on the 17th day of June, 1914:

Fellow Citizens of South Carolina:

I presume it would be useless to take up your time to remind you of how the Democratic clubs of 1912 were packed by the people of the towns and cities, of what class of men controlled those clubs, the county conventions, and later the State Convention—the corporation lawyers, the bankers, the cotton mill heads—particularly the railroad attorneys of prominence—in fact, the aristocracy, so-called, of this State; and then later the conducting of the primary election, the action of the State Executive Committee in trying to steal the election and defeat the will of the majority by claiming that there was fraud in the primary; the subcommittee that was appointed, which was not satisfied with meeting in this State, but having a North Carolinian, “Seaboard Bill,” at its head, went over into his native State to hold a meeting at Charlotte. All these matters are too fresh in your minds for it to be necessary for me to reiterate them here.

This year we were told, “Let’s have peace, let’s have no factionalism, let’s have quietude in politics.” The other side held out that they wanted peace. Yet we find, when they appeared at their club meetings throughout the State, something happens which has never

been known to take place in the history of the State before—this crowd comes with a printed ballot ready to hand around. In other places where they were not printed they were typewritten, which is practically the same. They packed their club meetings with every man that they could get to come, notwithstanding their cry, "Let's have no factionalism." In some counties they went so far as to carry negroes to the Democratic club meetings for the purpose of controlling the selection of delegates to the county convention. In the town of Newberry, Ward 2 club, one William Y. Fair, who for years has been a pronounced Republican, and who held the appointment of postmaster at Newberry as a Republican until he was dismissed by a Republican for being wrong in his accounts, was elected a delegate to the county convention. When the Democratic county convention convened they were packed with town delegates. Particularly is this true of the Ward 1 club of the city of Columbia—a ward which had three candidates for the office of Mayor and two for the office of Alderman in an election which was held the day after the county convention. Notwithstanding the interest that was taken in this election, and the number of candidates from this ward, including all three of the candidates for Mayor—this ward only polled 526 votes, which would have entitled them under the rules—one delegate for each twenty-five members—to twenty-one delegates in the county convention. Yet on the day previous this ward was represented in the county convention by fifty-three delegates. When their attention was called to it in the convention, Christie Benet, secretary of the State Democratic Executive Committee, and one of the delegates from this ward, took the floor and said: "We have 1,330 names on the Ward 1 roll. I think that this is an infernal fraud." Yet the secretary of the State Democratic Executive Committee and a member of this ward club consents to fifty-three delegates being seated in this convention as the representatives of 526 actual voters—thirty-two delegates more than they are entitled to. He says that it is an "infernal fraud," but votes for its perpetuation. I am informed that similar conditions existed in Ward 1 in Spartanburg—the ward represented by the chairman of the State Democracy. These are the men that arrogate to themselves the purifying of the primary, and are attempting to deprive the laboring classes of our State from participating therein.

In the county of Newberry, the county convention elected one Joseph L. Keitt chairman of the Democratic party of Newberry county—a man who years ago left the Democratic party and became

the leader of the Populists in this State, and who was a candidate for office on the Populist ticket. Yet this is the man who is today chairman of the Democracy of Newberry county, chosen by a packed convention of illegal delegates, chosen by clubs whose lists of membership were made up from rolls, as was the case in other counties, which included dead men and men who had long since moved away. In the county of Dorchester, where they had control, they elected as a member of the State Democratic Executive Committee a man who openly and publicly bolted the Democratic ticket and worked for McKinley for President against the then Democratic nominee. There are many other instances in the various counties which I could give, but it would take too much of my time and cost me too much to have it printed. The citizens of each county, however, know the conditions in their own county. I only give these few instances in order to open your eyes and show you that the other side have appealed to the negro, have appealed to the old-line Haskellites who themselves appealed to the negro, and have appealed to the Populists, to all come back and claim to be Democrats in order to defeat the will of the people and to defeat Blease and his friends.

THE STATE CONVENTION.

Now, look at your State Convention. Who composed it? The people from the various counties know who they were. You know what their past political affiliations have been. You know what their occupations were and are. The president of that convention, James A. Hoyt, is a corporation man and the president of three banks. The chairman of the credentials committee was Thomas M. Raysor, a Southern Railroad attorney, and who while a member of the State Senate representing the county of Orangeburg continuously kept in his pocket a pass on the Southern Railroad trains. The chairman of the committee on constitution and rules was B. E. Nicholson, of Edgefield, a corporation lawyer, son-in-law of Former Governor John C. Sheppard, who failed to get a second term for Governor at the hands of this crowd, and who endeavored to beat B. R. Tillman in 1892. I have not been able to discover who was the chairman of the committee on platform and resolutions, but I presume it was the District Attorney appointed by Senator E. D. Smith, because he, Francis H. Weston, read the report of the committee—another corporation lawyer and also a bank officer, and the representative on the floor of the State Senate of the corporate interests. Then we come to the great spokesman, who himself said that

in his own county in the last primary there were 400 stolen votes. I presume he said this because he was defeated for the State Senate in 1910 and for the House in 1912. I refer to William N. Graydon, who was a Haskellite of the bitterest type, and who, I am informed, stated on the floor of the convention that he knew there was fraud in the last primary and yet when asked the question if he prosecuted anybody for any of this fraud, could only answer, "No"—and when the investigating committee went to Abbeville, or made inquiry of the Abbeville people—their own committee—they refused to furnish the club rolls to that committee in order that the Abbeville primary might be investigated. Yet here is this great Haskellite, he who, with his associates, has appealed to the negro before, hollering fraud among the white people of our State.

And the chairman of the State Democratic Committee, re-elected by the convention—John Gary Evans, four times repudiated by the people as a candidate for the United States Senate—leading counsel in this State for the Western Union Telegraph Company and other corporations; and elected for vice president W. F. Stevenson, of the famous investigating committee of 1912, bank president, railroad attorney, and commonly known as "Seaboard Bill."

We find further in this convention many other lawyers and officers of corporations; but I want to ask you, out of the great county of Spartanburg, and the great county of Anderson and the great county of Greenville, with their very large farmer vote and their enormous cotton mill vote, how many farmers were sent as members of the Spartanburg, Anderson and Greenville delegation?—how many cotton mill men were in either delegation? How many farmers were there? These people who love them so much, these people who are going to raise the price of cotton to fifteen cents—did they allow these farmers to sit as delegates in this convention? How many cotton mill men were among the delegates? How many laboring men were there? Sift your convention thoroughly and you will find it composed of corporation lawyers, corporation officers and corporation stockholders. I could call them all, but it is useless. If these men who were in charge of the club meetings and the county conventions were such lovers of the interests of the people, when they had absolute control of these county conventions why didn't they elect some cotton mill men to represent themselves on the floor of the State Convention?—why didn't they elect some farmers?—why didn't they elect some poor men? No; they only wanted the rich, the corporation lawyers and the corporation officers, in order

that they might strike the poor man. I notice in the Senatorial obituary of Senator Smith that he puts himself down, not as a farmer, but as a "planter." I presume it was these associates of his—these "planters"—that they wanted, and not the plain farmers.

Now, look at their committees. They said, "Let's have no factionalism;" they said, "Let's deal fairly,"—yet look at their committees: Committee to prepare the books of enrollment—Willie Jones; next Neils Christensen, the senator from Beaufort, whose father was captain of a negro company in the Union Army, and fought the Confederate soldiers—that is the man who is to regulate the white man's primary in South Carolina; Christie Benet, the son-in-law of Alex. C. Haskell, the man who bolted the Democratic party and appealed to the negroes to defeat Tillman as the Democratic candidate of the people of this State. So with the special committee to arrange the Senatorial campaign itinerary. Both of these very important committees are absolutely packed with my bitterest enemies. Now, if they wanted no factionalism, and intended to be fair, why didn't they give us at least some of the representatives on these committees? Oh! no, they wanted to do as they did two years ago—have all star-chamber proceedings, so as to keep us from knowing anything about what they were doing, and finally wind up by robbing us at the ballot box, as they are going to attempt to do this year. As proof of it, I quote you just a sentence from one of their bitterest newspapers, whose editor sets himself up as a kind of half preacher. The *Greenwood Journal* says: "The thing that counts most is the counting after the ballots are cast." What does that mean but a hint to their managers that if they can not win by fair means to try to outcount us? Nothing could be plainer.

WHAT THIS CORPORATION-RIDDEN CONVENTION DID.

Now, what did this great, corporation-ridden convention do, my fellow citizens? They fixed it so that it makes it a hardship upon every laboring man in South Carolina to put his name upon a club roll. Why? Because he has to go in person to put it there. They knew it would be easy enough for their corporation lawyers and their bankers and their rich people in their towns to walk around and sign a club roll; they knew there would be nobody to dock them for the loss of time; nobody to charge them up with the loss of time or to threaten to dismiss them. But what about the farmers in the rural districts who have got to lose time from their crops and neglect their business in order to go and sign their club rolls? What about

the cotton mill men, who have got to leave their work and possibly be docked, and possibly threatened with dismissal if they dare leave their work? They knew this—these people who controlled this convention knew this—and they were fighting to endeavor to disfranchise this element of people—to put them on an equality, if it were possible, with the negro who is unable to obtain his registration certificate. The whole scheme and the whole purpose was to keep the cotton mill people and the laboring men of South Carolina from voting in the primary election. Some of their men boasted when they came out of the convention that they had disfranchised from 15,000 to 20,000 of Blease voters. But I want to warn them that they have not; that the people of this State will arise as they have never risen before, and they will have their names on those club rolls if it closes every cotton mill in South Carolina to do so, and the farmers who are Blease's friends will have their names on them, or they will know the reason why. Some newspapers holler, "It is fair, it is proper, it is no hardship." They know that they are lying. They know that the caucus held in the Jefferson Hotel the night before the State Convention fixed up this scheme as the best method they could devise to try to disfranchise Blease's friends, and well as it said that they "claimed to be going to give us Jeffersonian Democracy, but indeed they had given us Jefferson Hotel Autocracy." But their scheme in 1914, like their fraud and robbery in 1912, will fail. We propose to put our names on those rolls; and see that they are left there. The meanest thing that they did was to fix it so some little petit thief could cut an honest man's name off—so have a witness when you go. We propose to vote; we propose to see that our votes are counted fairly and squarely. Why, fellow citizens, they even had it fixed so that the votes should be counted in private; they even had it fixed so that the managers could take these boxes, with your tickets in them, and slip into a private room and lock themselves up, and keep you or anybody else from watching them when they stole from you. But a Bleasite, Solicitor Timmerman, arose in that convention and offered an amendment forcing them to do the counting in public. They thought it would be overlooked and they would slip it through. Of course, when attention was called to it on the floor of the convention their crowd had to accept the amendment. But if they were honest, and intended to act honestly, why didn't they put in that the votes should be counted in public, and not try to slip in a rule to count them in private in order to steal when they please?

THE PEOPLE ARE WATCHING.

Ah, gentlemen, the white people of this State have their eyes upon them, and they do not propose to be robbed by this gang. This convention that met in Columbia was not a representative body of the people of this State. The masses were not represented. The would-be representatives of the people were the broken-down aristocracy, the corporation lawyers and officers, and the officeholders; the Republican, the Populist, the Haskellite, with his appeal to the negro, etc., etc.

Now, when they got to this great convention, and hollered, "No factionalism," and "let's have peace," did they elect a Blease man president or vice president of the convention? Did they elect a Blease man chairman of the executive committee, or vice chairman? Did they elect a Blease man secretary or assistant secretary of the convention? Did they appoint a Blease man on any committee in the convention except by counties, and only then on a committee where they had to have a county represented and could not get any other but a Blease man? No; it was partisan, bitter partisan, from beginning to end, and it was the most diabolical attempt to rob the free white people of this State of participating in the primary elections that has ever been perpetrated in any State in the American Union. And by whom was it done? By Haskellites, Populists, Republicans. I have given you the names of some of them, and if they desire to dispute the assertion it is easy for me to give you the names of others. They claim to be great lovers of Mr. Bryan, the Secretary of State of this nation, and yet they took up in that convention men who had bolted the Democratic ticket when Bryan was nominated and had gone over and supported the Republican party. Yet, this is the crowd who set themselves up as the guardians of South Carolina's Democracy.

In the county of Richland, gentlemen, right in the city of Columbia, these enemies of the people have actually placed the books of enrollment of one of the clubs in the *Columbia State* newspaper building, and when my friends, or the friends of the people, want to get their names on a Democratic club roll, they have got to be humiliated by going into this building and sometimes by being harassed by people who know that they are my friends. They have also placed other club rolls in private offices, and placed them in the hands of those known to be my bitterest enemies—right in the city of Columbia and other places—hoping by this means to intimi-

date my friends, or when they come to enroll, try to humiliate them by dirty or slurring remarks about me. I want to ask the honest, fair-minded people of South Carolina, if they consider this fair treatment and honorable treatment to me and to my friends; and, if they do not, to stamp their disapproval upon it by standing by me in my attempt to defeat such mean and contemptible methods. The idea of a Democrat having to go into a building of a "Haskellite," a negro-appealing half-breed newspaper to get his name on a club roll! What will come next? And, in some wards and precincts they actually have not got the club rolls or places for them at all, but the people in those wards and precincts have to go out of their own ward or precinct and into another to enroll.

This is enough of this at the present, gentlemen. As I go from county to county, I shall take up local conditions and discuss them.

EFFORT TO DISFRANCHISE THE LABORING PEOPLE.

To show that Senator Smith endorses the action of this Haskell-Republican combination, in endeavoring to prevent the laboring men of this State from getting their names enrolled, and in giving to some little committee the authority to strike off names if they see fit, and otherwise hampering Democrats in taking part in the election, I quote you his interview in reference to the same, as published in *The News and Courier* of May 29th:

"Senator E. D. Smith said: 'I am gratified to see that the convention was so unanimous and harmonious, and that their action in modifying the primary rules was by such a tremendous majority of the convention.'"

There is his statement, gentlemen, unequivocal, of your recent State Convention's efforts to deprive the laboring and honest people of South Carolina of their votes—a scheme which is:

"First: Inconvenience them, keep them from voting.

"Second: If they can't read and write, humiliate them, expose them.

"Third: If they put their names on the books, and you see they have got us, strike off enough names, you committeemen, to leave us the majority.

"Fourth: You cotton mill presidents, within the sixty-day limit, turn off enough of your cotton mill men and their families to force them to leave your mills and to move to others, so that they will be out of their voting precincts, and if you can not get up any other

scheme, close down your mills and make out orders are short—do anything to force these people to move from one precinct to another and thereby deprive them of the right to vote.

"Last, but by no means least, if you can not beat them this way, appoint only anti-Blease managers and count them out at the polls."

I have done all within my power to have fair elections in the past, and have already this year issued a proclamation, and had it published in the leading dailies and many other papers of this State, offering a reward of one hundred dollars, each, for the first ten convictions of any person or persons who shall violate the election laws, either by bribery, intimidation, or otherwise. I presume some of you have seen this proclamation. Many of you may have not, for the daily newspapers that published it generally published it in an out-of-the-way place, hiding it as effectively as they could, where possibly, no one would see it, and failed even to call attention to it. If such a proclamation had been issued from their side of the house, you would have seen editorials endorsing the course of the Governor, and calling special attention to his effort to have fair elections. But, of course, as I have done it, they attempt to hide it instead of approving it.

WARNING THE PEOPLE.

It may be said by some that this is not discussing national issues, that this is not discussing great questions which will come up before the United States Senate, but that it is discussing factionalism. I want it distinctly and positively understood now that I am not in this race for personal honors or profit, but that I am in it to be of benefit to my friends—to those people who have stood by me and supported me, and I propose to call their attention, as I go around over this State, to conditions in this State, in order that they may not be deceived, and when the campaign shall have been finished, if they see fit to vote for me for the United States Senate, I shall go to the Senate and stand flat-footed by the Democratic party and the Democratic platform, and I shall not appeal, as the other side have done, to Haskellites, Populists and Republicans. If I am not elected I will have no personal grouch; I will have done my part and posted the people thoroughly upon conditions. When I have done that, if the people of this State desire to go on and be ruled and controlled by the classes and by the element which controlled this last State Convention, then all that can be said of me is that I did my part; that I obtained the ambition of my life and served four years as

Governor of my State; that I did what I could to warn my people and that the oppression and class legislation which may hereafter be placed upon them cannot be laid at my door—for I have sounded the warning.

I know that I will be elected to the United States Senate. Two years ago, you will recall, the newspapers heralded, "Blease is defeated, the people are against Blease." The newspapers would come out after every campaign meeting and say that "the crowd was with Mr. Jones and all against Blease." But when the ballots were counted these statements were shown to be lies. This year you will hear the same old tale—"Blease is losing ground, Smith is picking up and gaining." But, my friends, just remember two years ago and you will know what the purpose is.

If you hear a man going around saying, "I fought for Blease two years ago, but I am not going to vote for him this year," find out first if he is telling the truth as to his position two years ago. I have personally caught two men recently who said that they once were Blease men and voted for him, but could not vote for him again—when I made investigation I found that neither of them voted for me or supported me two years ago. This is but a lie they are getting up in order to try to create the impression that Blease is losing ground—a lie made up by some of them, and being told by some of them. Again, when you hear a man saying that he was once for Blease but is now against him, ask him if Blease failed to do him some favor which was not consistent with Blease's duty to the people; ask him if Blease failed to lend him some money or to endorse a note for him; ask him if Blease failed to appoint him to some job he wanted, or a member of his family to some job he wanted that member of his family to have; ask him if Blease failed to parole or pardon some convict who was not entitled to clemency. Ask him if one of these things is what made him mad. Of course, I could not appoint all applicants to office, but I have appointed, as I said I would do, my friends. Where I had to choose between friends, and had only one office to give, I could not appoint all, and that has made some people mad. Some pardon papers have been presented to me which I did not think justified me in granting a pardon or parole, and I have refused to do so, and of course that has made some people mad. Sometimes when I have granted pardons or paroles on strong petitions which I felt justified me in doing so, people have got mad about that. Some people have come to me and asked me to lend them money, and when I did not have it to

lend they would get mad. Others have asked me to endorse notes for them, and when I did not believe they would ever be able to pay the notes, and declined to endorse them because I was not able to lose the money, they would get mad. These things will happen in the course of affairs, but I have assurances from every county in this State that I am stronger than I have ever been throughout South Carolina, and that the victory this year is surely mine. So be not deceived. But I beg you not only to go and get your names on the registration lists that have been fixed up for your names by the Haskellites, the Populists and the former Republican combination, but go to your ballot box and vote, and after you have voted, do not go back home and sit down and be satisfied; stay at the box and see those votes counted; watch the fellow who calls them out, and have somebody else to watch the man who puts them down, and see that they are not miscalled and not put down improperly. If you will do your part I am going to do mine, and there is no doubt of the result.

THE HASKELL CONVENTION.

You will notice that Senator Ellison DuRant Smith was not in this convention, notwithstanding the fact that he was elected a delegate from the county of Lee, which county, I presume, he claims now as his home. However, we find him in the Haskell Convention of 1890, associating with the crowd who now controls this convention, from the county of Sumter, at the head of the Sumter delegation. In order to show you the record along this line, I herewith quote the report of the Haskell Convention of 1890, to be found in the second edition of *The News and Courier*, published at 4:30 a. m., Friday morning, October 10th, 1890, which reads in part as follows:

"THE HASKELL CONVENTION"

"ROLL OF DELEGATES."

"THE FOLLOWING IS THE COMPLETE ROLL."

"SUMTER—E. D. SMITH, W. T. Dixon, W. T. Aycock, "J. D. Blanding," and fourteen others whose names are given.

This report is signed, "N. G. G.," which was the way that the then manager of *The News and Courier* Bureau of Columbia signed his articles to that paper. That manager was N. G. GONZALES. This was before the *Columbia State* newspaper was in existence, and this man was the *Columbia* correspondent of *The News and Courier*,

and himself an advocate of the Haskell Convention and the Haskell party, and a very enthusiastic follower, and it is presumed that he knew the delegates to that convention personally, and that he gave a correct report of its membership and of its actions and doing; AND,

"Gonzales wrote the names of those whom Haskell would bless; "And lo! in Sumter, E. D. Smith's led all the rest."

For eighteen long years this record of that convention stood without contradiction, and without question—Mr. Smith then being a resident of the county of Sumter. But, eighteen long years after this had been published, and when it seemed that everybody had forgotten it, the charge, all at once, is preferred against Smith, that he was a member of that convention, and he sends a telegram all over the State denying it, and one to *The State* paper, a copy of which follows: "My attention has been called to an advertisement in this morning's paper to the effect that I was a bolter and a member of the Haskell Convention and ran as an independent for the Legislature in Sumter county. I denounce as absolutely false each of these statements." This appeared in *The State* Tuesday morning, September 8th, 1908, page 10, column 4. The *Columbia State*, edited by a Gonzales, comes out in his defense, and says as follows:

"*The State*: Columbia, S. C., Tuesday morning, September 8th, 1908 (page 4, column 2):"

"ABSOLUTELY FALSE."

"Had E. D. Smith been a member of the 'Haskell Convention' he would doubtless willingly accept full responsibility for occupying an honorable position, but as a matter of fact he was not a member of that body."

"The allegation that he was, was made in a letter signed 'An Old Soldier of Gen. N. G. Evans' Brigade,' and printed yesterday by the Evans people, who called on the people to vote against Smith on that account. The same 'Old Soldier' asserted that Smith committed further 'treachery' to the Democratic party in 1890 in that 'he also ran for the Legislature in Sumter county that same year and was defeated.' Now, Mr. Smith comes forward and declares absolutely false each of these statements."

"As to my running as an independent in Sumter county," says Mr. Smith, "I ran on the regular ticket and was elected by the

largest vote given any candidate in the race, heading the ticket AT THAT TIME, and doing the same two years later, as the records will show."

"Now, then, 'Somebody has lied,' and lied in a more than usually despicable manner. And the liar should be exposed. It would be grossly unfair to spring a true story like this on a candidate for the Senate at an hour so late that his reply could not reach the people, but when the story is utterly false, the product of a venomous, malice-bearing soul, there should be some shameful punishment to fit the shameful crime."

Mr. Smith was not elected "AT THAT TIME," to the House, as the House Journal of 1890 clearly shows.

It was then, and is now, impossible for man to punish the dead. Who was the author of "The product of a venomous, malice-bearing soul?" Was it the brother of the Editor who wrote this? If so, he was dead and while "there should be some shameful punishment to fit the shameful crime," he had passed man's reach and we dare not ask God to inflict some shameful punishment. This article of September 8th, 1908, says, "As a matter of fact he was not a member of the Haskell Convention." N. G. G. says he was. N. G. G. was there at the convention, its in-fact secretary, if not in name, and he says E. D. Smith was there, and for eighteen (18) years E. D. does not correct or deny it, but after N. G. Gonzales is dead, Smith says it's a lie. AND, HEAR YE! LISTEN! N. G. G.'s brother, to save Smith, says, "IT'S THE PRODUCT, ETC." Only that N. G. G. could say, "Yes, I lied. E. D. Smith was not there."

BUT, here is another witness, and not from the dead, the reporter of the then "*The Columbia Daily Register*," Columbia, S. C., Friday, October 10th, 1890, in its report on page 4, says:

"HASKELL NOMINATION."

"The chairman of each delegation handed up a list of delegates, and the roll, when made up, contained the following names, representing twenty counties."

"SUMTER—E. D. SMITH, A. Smith, A. Owens, W. T. Dixon, Henry Spann, English DeChamps, J. D. Blanding, W. T. Aycock," and others.

"AND LO! BEN ADHEM'S NAME LED ALL THE REST."

And, still another witness, a paper of the county of Sumter, the then home of Delegate E. D. Smith, in its issue of October 15th, 1890, says:

"WATCHMAN AND SOUTHRON, OCTOBER 15, 1890."

"Published every Wednesday by N. G. Osteen."

"THE HASKELL CONVENTION."

"A full State Ticket nominated, each candidate being chosen by acclamation.

"THE ROLL OF DELEGATES:"

"The Convention was composed of one hundred and eighty-six delegates, representing twenty counties. The following is a complete roll:

"SUMTER—E. D. SMITH, A. Smith, J. C. Singleton, A. O. Owens, W. T. Dixon, Henry Spann, English DeChamps, J. D. Blanding, A. F. Cousar, J. W. Rhame, S. W. Wilson, E. F. Darby, W. T. Aycock, M. C. Karesh, R. W. Owens, John Singleton, R. M. Cooper, L. C. Mills."

"AND LO! BEN ADHEM'S NAME LED ALL THE REST."

Now, did these reports also lie on E. D. Smith? Did Smith ever write this paper—*The Watchman and Southron*—a correction, or a denial of his being in the Haskell Convention? Surely he must have seen *The Columbia Daily Register*; certainly, if not, *The News and Courier*, and surely if neither of these, his home paper, his county paper—*The Watchman and Southron*.

Yes, we all say, "Now, then, 'Somebody has lied,' and lied in a more than usually despicable manner." Blease don't say who—but truly, "Somebody has lied." Was it N. G. Gonzales; the reporter of *The Columbia Daily Register*; the reporter of *The Watchman and Southron*, and other newspaper men who were present and sent their papers reports of this convention that lied so shamefully, or was it—Oh! Who was it, lied? For eighteen years these minutes stood as uncontradicted records, but all at once, eighteen years after the record was made and N. G. Gonzales was dead, "The product of a venomous, malice-bearing soul" was discovered. Poor soul! Is it in a dead or living body?

It would astonish you, my fellow citizens, if I were to call over the names of the men who were in the recent State Convention calling themselves Democrats, who were in the Haskell State Convention, and who were members of the county executive committees of the Haskell party, that were appealing to the free negroes in 1890 to defeat the Reform party which was at that time headed by

Tillman and Gary. Now this same crowd of Haskellites, Republicans, Deasites, Populists and others are fixing requirements by which they say you, the loyal, true Democrats of 1876 and of 1890, can participate in a Democratic primary if you comply with these requirements. How long, fellow citizens, will you submit to such corruption and such tyranny?

The Columbia Daily Register, Friday, October 10th, 1890, in reporting the Haskell Convention quotes the delegates as saying:

"In addition to these bad methods, the utterances of Mr. Tillman have been a wrong to the State and all our people. His speeches have been a tissue of false charges, which every man who respects truth and religion should condemn, not in words alone, but by the power intrusted to his care—his vote at the ballot box.

"We further solemnly allege that B. R. Tillman and his associates, by dividing the people, by instigating the lowest passions, by severing family ties, putting father, son and brother against each other, have caused more harm and brought greater sorrow on the State than the sword or fire, or the hand of man in any other shape have ever before effected.

"They should not be honored and rewarded for this terrible wrong, nor should power be put in their hands to perpetuate the wrong. It is a terrible mistake to think that such wrongdoers ever stop of their own will."

This was Smith's opinion of the Reform movements in 1890; if not, why didn't he get up in the convention and oppose this statement of the Haskell Convention platform. But, N. G. Gonzales says, in *The News and Courier*:

"Applause was given the paragraph which refers to the injury which Tillman had done the State, and at the close of the address there was an outburst of cheers and the new declaration of independence duly adopted."

The Columbia Daily Register, Thursday, October 16th, 1890, on page 2, says:

"HASKELL ENDORSED."

"THE COLORED CONFERENCE DECIDED TO SUPPORT HIS TICKET. A LONG SESSION AT WHICH MANY SPEAKERS ARE HEARD. THE ENDORSEMENT CARRIED AMID GREAT EXCITEMENT."

"In pursuance of a call issued, etc., etc., delegates from counties gathered in the chamber of the House of Representatives

yesterday at 12 o'clock." Prof. J. W. Morris was elected chairman. A. J. Jamison was elected Secretary. Delegates were enrolled as follows"—giving names of several counties.

"Following resolution was made and adopted:

"That we recommend that the negroes, for the betterment of their condition do vote for the Haskell State Ticket."

"The result created much excitement. Tumultuous applause for fully five minutes, etc."

So, the negro convention endorsed the Haskell statements about Tillman and his followers.

QUOTING FROM THE NEWSPAPERS OF 1890.

The News and Courier of November 4, 1890, in its editorial columns, under the head, "Follow Your Leaders," said:

"The contest at the polls today is not a contest between Tillman and Haskell, but between the Democratic party and the Republican party, between the white people and the negroes, between the true Democracy and Independentism in its most dangerous form. It is the imperative duty of every Democratic voter to go to the polls today and vote the regular Democratic ticket."

General Wade Hampton, in a letter to State Chairman Irby, said:

"I am impelled to support the September ticket because it was nominated by the Democratic Convention and because the other ticket lacks that endorsement."

As I have heretofore stated, General Hampton said that an Independent was worse than a Radical.

You, therefore, have the opinion now of the *Charleston News and Courier*, and the opinion of General Hampton as to Mr. Smith's Democracy in 1890; but, still, if there be any doubting Thomases, here is some more.

Mr. William H. Lyles, in *The News and Courier* of Monday morning, November 3, 1890, had a card headed, "The Haskell Tickets," in which he said:

"To the Editor of *The News and Courier*: Upon the request of certain Republicans in this city our committee did deliver to them a supply of our tickets to be forwarded to such of their party as desire to vote for Judge Haskell."

This is signed by Mr. William H. Lyles, Chairman, who was the chairman of the Haskell Independent Executive Committee.

General Matthew Calbraith Butler said, speaking at that time, on that same day, in this same paper:

"There is no middle ground in this State—no half-way house. A man must be either a Democrat or a Republican."

So here we have Chairman Lyles saying that he gave his tickets to the negroes to be sent to other negroes, and General Butler saying that a man must be a Democrat or a Republican. Therefore, those who did not support the regular Democratic nominees were designated by General Butler as Republicans.

Mr. E. W. Dabbs, writing from Mayesville, S. C., October 31, 1890, to *The News and Courier*, as printed in said paper under big headlines, "The Black Man Has a Vote," on page 3, November 3, 1890, says:

"Right now I think every colored tenant and landowner should vote for Judge Haskell and honest government, and I believe they will."

So here you have Mr. Smith's other very great friend, Mr. Dabbs, appealing to the negroes to "vote for Judge Haskell and honest government" against the Reformers of 1890.

The News and Courier, again speaking on November 3, 1890, under the headline, "Vote the Regular Ticket," says:

"The question for every Democratic voter to answer for himself tomorrow is, Shall I vote with the white people of the State or shall I vote with the negroes? At bottom, the struggle at the polls tomorrow will be determined on the color line."

The Charleston *World* of November 5th, 1890, in speaking of Charleston, said, under the head, "Haskell Republicans:"

"It can no longer be doubted where the Haskellites stand. Candidate Joseph W. Barnwell had a carriage, and he visited every polling precinct in the city. At every polling precinct yesterday there were little tables presided over by colored men. On each of these tables were Haskell tickets which were given to all Republicans who were entitled to vote."

The News and Courier of Wednesday morning, November 5th, 1890, under its Columbia date line, the article being signed, "N. G. G.," says:

"Judge Haskell took his defeat with great serenity and a smiling face. Col. Blanding came over from Sumter and Mr. Barnwell from Charleston. Neither of them is able to account for the sudden determination of the negroes not to vote."

This is the same Mr. Barnwell that recently took such great part in fixing the rules for the Democratic party. Why was he so interested in the negro vote? He then tried to disrupt the Democratic party, and he is now, with his colleagues, endeavoring to drive the Democrats from their party by such stringent rules, in the endeavor to disrupt it again. I have no doubt of his purpose, but he most assuredly will fail now, as he did then, for we are Democrats, and are going to stay in the party, and we are going to win this election in the primary.

In Sumter, the then home county of Mr. Smith, the vote in the election of 1890 was as follows: Tillman 838, Haskell 749. In Newberry county the vote was: Tillman 1,694, Haskell 344. In Sumter, in the Congressional race, the vote for E. M. Brayton was 234, for William Elliott 788, and for Thos. E. Miller (colored) 1,158. *The News and Courier* of November 5th reports the Congressional vote in Newberry county as follows: Johnstone 1,426, Tolbert 285.

Sumter is Smith's county; Newberry is Blease's.

Lynchburg, the home of Senator Smith, recorded her vote as follows, as reported in *The News and Courier* of November 5th, 1890: State Officers—Tillman ticket 59, Haskell ticket 40.

SOMEBODY LIED—WHO WAS IT?

Truly, gentlemen, somebody lied;—now, who was it? Did N. G. Gonzales lie on Smith, when he reported him in this convention, and as chairman of the Sumter delegation? I do not care to answer the question. *The State* says somebody lied. I would like for *The State* to tell us who?

Later, we find Mr. Smith running for the Legislature and being defeated in Lee county, claiming that as his home. In 1908, when he was a candidate for the United States Senate, we find the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Florence endorsing "Our fellow citizen, E. D. Smith," against John Gary Evans, in very strong resolutions. So, we find this rolling stone a citizen of several counties. Which one he now claims for home I am unable to say, but in the Lee county convention it was agreed by certain parties, as Mr. Smith was a candidate for United States Senate, and as Mr. B. Frank Kel-

ley was a candidate for Lieutenant Governor, that both of these gentlemen should be elected to the State Convention. E. D. Smith was not endorsed by that convention for re-election to the United States Senate, as has been stated by some of his friends. B. Frank Kelley was endorsed for Lieutenant Governor, and a resolution was passed in that convention instructing the delegates to the State Convention to oppose all restrictions of the primary. Senator Smith dodged that convention, on the claim that he was too busy in Washington. Yet, we find him down at River Bridge, in Colleton county, just a little while before, making a speech. We find him a little later at Lynchburg, accompanied by one of his colleagues, making a speech. We find him over in Florence, at Timmons ville, making a speech, and we find him at other times down here making speeches, but he gets too busy to attend to this important matter for his party. WHY? Because his hands were tied by the resolution adopted by the Lee county convention, which resolution instructed the delegates from that county to vote against any changes in the rules and constitution of the Democratic party.

Isn't it strange that for five long years he sat in the United States Senate and the newspapers raved at him; criticised him and made of him a laughing-stock—one of them going so far as to say: "Ellison DuRant," and right after it they were so kind as to say, "He sho do Rant." Now, this same paper is boosting him to the skies as a great statesman.

The *Columbia State*, in an editorial headed "Cotton," says:

"Our friend E. D. Smith writes as fluently as he talks and his card printed today is another of those presentations of one side of a subject that will appeal readily to the receptive but not to the analytical mind. Mr. Smith does not attempt to meet one argument for business methods and sanity presented by *The State*. Mr. Smith, and many others, blind themselves to the fact that the South cannot strike the manufacturers without the missile proving a boomerang. Efforts to develop new markets and to clothe naked people must cease, for new territory is won only with cheap goods. And so the mills of the world must reduce consumption and the demand for Southern cotton be greatly lessened. That is the common sense result, and no amount of skyrocketing can shake the logic of it. Now, why should there be this perennial poker and tongs battle between producer and manufacturer? Mr. Smith fails to make a strong presentation on that point. We wonder if South Carolina farmers, Mr.

Smith included, would consider themselves the enemies of wheat growers, if in the face of a combination to sell flour at \$4.50 a barrel, they bought it from some millers at \$4.30? Let the farmers give business methods and industry a more prolonged trial, and with them only will they achieve permanent success."

I could go on and cite you many other things to show you why, fellow citizens, these now wonderful worshippers of Mr. Smith, only a few years ago, were making fun of him and holding him up to ridicule. Of course, I presume they will say because they have discovered his wonderful ability; and, probably he will say that they found that they would have a man in Washington who could control the patronage handed out to them, and others, who appealed to the negroes and Haskellites, as I have shown you, in 1890.

SENATOR SMITH'S APPOINTEES.

In 1908; when he was a candidate for the United States Senate, the *Columbia State* was against him and for Rhett; but, as soon as the race came down between Smith and their arch enemy, John Gary Evans, they turned to Smith, as the least of the two evils, and began to plead for Smith. Result! When Smith was elected, he immediately stepped into *The State* office and got his private secretary, right in the face of his friends and associates—took for his private secretary a man who had belonged to the labor union and had scabbed on them—that is, violated his pledge as a labor union man, and had worked as a scab in a strike. This was his reward, given him by Smith, who claims to be the friend of the laboring man. *The State* immediately became a great advocate of Smith, and is finally rewarded by Smith appointing its editor Consul to Cuba, and endorses for appointment by the National Democratic Administration only such people as the *Columbia State* crowd would give their O. K. to. His United States District Attorney Weston was captain of a military company in Columbia when the Darlington Riot broke out. He was commanded to go forward; he threw down his commission and refused to go, thus defying the then Governor Tillman. This is the same Weston who, while in the State Senate, asked to be excused from voting on certain measures because he was interested in corporations. Yet, gentlemen, this is the man who Smith appointed to be United States District Attorney for South Carolina, to enforce the laws of the United States against trusts and corporations—a man who admitted, by asking to be excused from voting as a State Senator on certain measures, that he was interested in

and owner in trusts and corporations. And, the same attorney who assisted the Southern Railroad in its celebrated merger case and other suits, while Senator. And, he appoints as his Assistant District Attorney one B. W. Crouch, a bank president and corporation lawyer, who had also served the interests of the corporations while a member of the State Senate of South Carolina. Mr. Smith says he is opposed to trusts and corporations; yet, look at the two lawyers he appointed in South Carolina to break up the trusts, the mergers, and corporation combinations—two of their members and representatives. No wonder they fought the appointment of some people so hard, and fought together for these corporation servants; and, yet, this is the Mr. Smith who is such a great friend to the laboring man, and such a bitter opponent of the trusts and corporations. If we do not get any of the trusts broke up until Frank Weston and Ben Crouch break them up, they will be with us for all time—"Yea! Even until the end."

Another one of Mr. Smith's appointees, James L. Sims, United States Marshal, admitted that he worked in a newspaper office, setting type, and helped to get out a negro-loving paper in 1876, at Kingstree, S. C. He attempted to dodge this responsibility by saying he was not its editor. All right, if he had been a true Democrat and a true Southerner, before he would have set the type that abused and vilified Wade Hampton and the Democratic party, and tried to perpetuate Chamberlain and his gang in office, he would have torn down that type and got him another job. Having stayed there and set type, he was more responsible than the editor himself, because if the editor could not have found anyone to set his type, he certainly could not have gotten out his paper.

Another one of his appointees—W. E. Gonzales, a Haskellite, an open and known defender of the negro, and one who, when a negro assaults a white woman, denounces as murderers and hoodlums those who take that negro to a tree and lynch him, in defense of the virtue of the white women of our State. (See Smith's vote to pay negro families \$2,000.00, when lynched for this crime.)

Today there are Republicans holding offices all over the State of South Carolina—negroes in the mail coaches and negroes in towns and cities delivering mail to the white ladies at their doors. Mr. Smith, who claims to be next to the Administration, and having all power therewith, quietly sits in his seat in the Senate and makes no effort to remove these negroes from their jobs, or remove them from the postoffices, but allows them to hold over, to the detriment of our

people and our party. And there are today 225,000 negroes in Federal employment, drawing \$1,250,000.00 per annum, some who work in the same rooms, at the same tables, with white employees; where negro men are in charge of bureaus, and, therefore, under whom white women, white girls and white men work, and are forced to take directions from them, or to be turned out of their jobs. Has our Senator done anything to relieve that situation? Has he used his influence with the President of these great United States to stop that? If so, we have heard nothing from it. However, Mr. Smith's actions in the Senate, on the negro question, have been quite consistent, following up his Haskell vote of 1890. In 1898, when he was a member of the House of Representatives of this State, he voted against the Separate Coach Law, which vote will be found on page 424 of the House Journal, 1898. Mr. W. S. Smith moved to recommit the bill (which, of course, was to kill it). The yeas and nays were requested. Those voting in the affirmative (to kill the bill) were, All, Anderson (the negro member from Georgetown), W. P. Pollock, Pyatt, E. D. Smith, W. F. Stevenson ("Seaboard Bill"), and others. Thus, voting to compel our white ladies to ride in the same coach, on the railroad trains with free negroes.

SENATOR SMITH'S RECORD ON NEGRO QUESTION.

In the year 1900, when a bill was introduced in the General Assembly to do away with that section of the Constitution which provides that NOT LESS THAN TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS shall be paid to the family of a negro who is lynched for committing rape, or assault with intent to ravish, upon a white woman, and is lynched by the white people of the community in the defense of the virtue of our white women and the homes of our farmers in the rural districts, Mr. Smith voted against the bill, and to leave the law as it is today—which is, to pay that negro's family NOT LESS THAN TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS because the white people of the community broke his neck for ruining and desecrating a white home. You will find this vote recorded on page 321, House Journal of 1900, as follows: Those voting for the bill: Messrs. Ashley, Bailey, Blease, Brantley, Caughman, and others. Those voting AGAINST THE BILL: Messrs. Bacot, Davis, Manning, E. D. SMITH, STEVENSON, WESTON, and others. Two-thirds of the members having failed to vote for the joint resolution, the joint resolution was rejected. So, these gentlemen, by voting against this resolution, fixes it so that when a negro is lynched for assaulting a white woman,

his family shall be paid NOT LESS THAN TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS.

In the State Democratic Convention, of which he was a member in 1912, when a resolution was passed endorsing the repeal of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, thereby depriving the negro of his right to vote, Senator Smith voted to kill that resolution and retain for the negro his right to vote; and, in the National Democratic Convention of 1912, when a resolution to that effect was introduced by a Western delegate, he again did not vote for it. This is but in keeping with his Haskell policy and other votes along this line, as I will show you later.

However, all of a sudden, sometime after these conventions—more than a year after, and nearly five years after he had become a United States Senator, he introduced a bill to repeal the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. He did it, though, after he knew I would be a candidate for the United States Senate, and after the amendment had been passed to elect Senators by the people. Being a Southern man, why did he not introduce this measure years before? Why did he not vote for this repeal in the convention of 1912—in the convention of his own State, and in the National Democratic Convention? He did not know then, gentlemen, that Blease would be a candidate for the Senate, and that he would be called upon to explain to the people his position on this negro proposition.

We find that he all at once discovered—about five years after he had been a Senator, that a negro could ride in a Pullman coach, and introduced a bill to regulate the same in the South; when, as a matter of fact, gentlemen, he knew the night that he was sworn in as a member of the United States Senate, or the night following, that negroes rode in Pullman coaches. Why? Because I, myself, was in the coach and had a berth reserved to come from Washington home. Senator Smith came in. I spoke to him pleasantly and asked him to take a seat by me. He said, "No, I have not made any arrangements about a berth yet; I could not get anything in the office, and I want to see this conductor." He walked on back to the rear of the coach; came back in a few minutes, and stated that he could not get a berth on the train; that there was none to be had. There was a negro sitting across the aisle, who arose from his seat and spoke to me, and said, "Colonel, I will let Senator Smith have my berth." I told Senator Smith that the negro was Dr. Stevenson (who now practices medicine in Columbia). Senator Smith spoke

to him, and the negro offered him his berth. Senator Smith said, "No, I would not think of depriving you that way; I can sit up to Florence." The negro said, "No, Senator, you take my berth, and I will go in the smoker and sleep with the colored porter." After some little conversation, Senator Smith thanked him for his kindness. Now, Smith knew then—just the same day or the day after he had been sworn in as a United States Senator, that a negro had a berth reserved, and that he rode in that Pullman car in a berth from Washington, D. C., to Florence, S. C. He knew that that negro offered to give him that berth, and he knew that the berth was paid for and occupied by the negro; yet, nothing is done by this Senator along this line until Railroad Commissioner Richards, of this State—five years after—began to raise a row about negroes occupying Pullman berths, and all at once the Senator's eyes were opened to the fact that a negro can ride in a Pullman coach—in the very berth beneath, or above, or next to, the berth occupied by a white lady or white ladies. He knew no State law could touch it, on account of the Interstate Commerce Laws, and yet, for five years after this thing has happened to him in person, he sits quiet and says nothing, but when Blease happens to run for the Senate, knowing his views on this subject, the Senator immediately gets busy and offers the bill. But, what has become of it since he has offered it? What has become of his bill to repeal the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments? He has not had influence enough to put them through, but he simply offers them and holds them up as a bluff—that he may say to the people, I have offered these bills. You want a man who will take them up and fight for them—a man who will not be afraid to stand up and fight for them notwithstanding the Northern influence, or back down on them after he has introduced them.

SENATOR SMITH'S RECORD ON LABOR LEGISLATION.

Mr. Smith claims to be a great friend of the laboring people. When did he get converted? He voted against the bill which was introduced in the General Assembly in 1900 to give the Street Railway Conductors and Motormen, and the Cotton Mill people of this State the right to sue those corporations on equal terms as railroad employees can sue a railroad company; thus depriving them of their legal right to go into court and be redressed for their wrongs. You will find that vote in the Journal of 1900, on page 262. When did he get to loving the laboring man so? When did he fall so much in love with the Cotton Mill Boys and the Street Railway Boys?

When he was trying to deprive them of a God-given right by passing a simple little law to protect them or their widows and children in case of injury or death? After he had been Senator for five long years, we find him writing to a friend in each county of the State asking "for the names and postoffice addresses of such teachers as are now engaged in teaching schools in the cotton factory centers of your county." Think of it—five years Senator before he thinks enough of the cotton mill people to even find out the names of those teaching in the schools; but all at once, right on the eve of his campaign for re-election, he does become interested enough to ask who they are. This is in keeping with his vote to deprive the fathers and mothers of the boys and girls that these teachers are teaching from having a right to sue these corporations when injured.

Another time, possibly he was a friend of the poor people and taxpayers, as shown by his vote in 1900, page 531 and page 557, of the House Journal of that year, when he voted to pay the old fraudulent State Bonds, which we had such a terrible fight to keep off of the State of South Carolina. If these old fraudulent bonds should have had to been paid the taxpayers of this State would have been worse burdened than they are today. Now, you know, as well as I do, who have to pay taxes; and yet this great friend of the farmers wanted them to pay these negro-Republican bonds.

AS TO "RAISING THE PRICE OF COTTON."

They say he has raised the price of cotton. I would like to know the number of bills that he has introduced in Congress that have been passed and become law in the years he has been there. If talk has raised the price of cotton, possibly he has raised it; but, if any bill has been passed by the United States Senate that E. D. Smith introduced, I must confess that I have overlooked it. Some people have tried to credit him with the Smith-Lever bill. Some of his friends have told people that it was his bill, but the records show that it was Hoke Smith, of Georgia, and not E. D. Smith, of South Carolina. So, be not deceived along that line, and don't forget that both Hoke Smith and Lever are lawyers.

Smith has always been, and is today opposed to the Reform movement of 1890; was elected to the Legislature from Sumter county in 1898 because he was opposed to it and was defeated later in Lee county for the same reason, and Lever beat him for Congress because Lever was a Reformer and Smith was not. If Smith is such a farmer and such a friend to them, why did he oppose the

farmers' movement of 1890, and on up to date? Look at the company he keeps, and judge him.

Who is his political allies and associates?—The *Columbia State, The News and Courier, The Greenville News, The Spartanburg Herald, The Columbia Record, et al.*; Gonzales, Weston, Sims, Heyward, Lyles, Raysor, Graydon, Joe Barnwell, the Haskell candidate for Attorney General; Ed. Robertson, LeRoy Springs and such like, all against the farmers' reform movement for the laboring people. Ask yourself why are all of these and the bankers, railroad heads, trust officers, etc., for Smith?

THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

My fellow citizens, I have no frank over the express company, and I have no franking privilege through the United States mail, as Smith has, by which I could send my advertising matter in the form of personal letters, or otherwise, all over the State free of charge. Every letter I mail, every express package I send out and the newspaper articles you see from me, I have to pay for. *The News and Courier* absolutely refused to publish, at any price, a speech I delivered at Walterboro on the 11th of April. My Private Secretary went in person to *The News and Courier* office and requested them to publish it as advertising matter, and to name the price for which they would publish it as advertising, they having refused to publish it as news, and they stated they would not publish it at any price. Yet they published an account of that same speech written by their local correspondent at Walterboro, and in this account of the speech, published on the first page of *The News and Courier*, it was reported: "Many capable critics were heard to express the opinion that the speech today was one of the strongest ever delivered by Governor Blease, and that the issues were presented in a clear and logical manner. He was constantly interrupted by applause and shouts from his audience. A more enthusiastic audience to hear the opening gun of the campaign could hardly have been found in any other county, and the meeting as a whole was attended by good feeling and friendship. NO REFERENCE WHATSOEVER WAS MADE TO SENATOR SMITH AND THE DISCUSSION WAS CONDUCTED ON A HIGH PLANE." Yet this newspaper, which professes to be fair, refused to publish the speech as it was delivered, even for pay, because it did not want its readers to have the truth.

I have been sent many, many letters, signed by Senator Smith and directed to others, franked through the United States mail—on one end of the envelope, "United States Senate, Committee of Immigration, Free," and on the other end, "E. D. SMITH, U. S. S." Some of these letters had a little cotton chart in them, which was used as an attempted excuse to pass them through the mails free. But on the wind-up they would say: "I should appreciate an expression of your opinion as to my work, together with any suggestion you may wish to make," which showed that the little cotton chart which was put in was only an excuse for free service. From the number of these which have been sent to me, I have a right to presume that they were broadcasted throughout the State; and, I have had people ask me why Smith did not write them before he began his campaign for re-election; that he has been up there five and a half years and this is the first letter they have received from him.

NEWSPAPER MISREPRESENTATIONS.

The refusal of the newspapers to publish my side of the various matters which come up, although they are always ready and eager to publish the other side, is not their only mean and contemptible method. It is the malicious lies they publish on me on every possible occasion that is the meanest part of their program. Of course, I cannot cite you to all the instances where I have been maliciously lied upon by the newspapers, because it has happened every day. But I wish to give you just an instance or two to let you know what is going on.

Recently, on May 13th, the *Charleston News and Courier* published that I had refused to allow the German Fusilliers of Charleston to go out of the State to attend a German festival. *The Columbia Record* of May 12th carried under big headlines, "Blease Won't Let Soldiers Leave State," saying I had refused to let this company go to Savannah. Both these newspapers must have known this was false, and therefore it was maliciously false. If they did not know the facts they could easily have been informed of the facts. The telegram of Capt. Ortman to me was received by me a little after 10 o'clock a. m. on the 12th of May. This telegram asked for permission to leave the State. It was answered as follows: "Your wire. Permission for your company to leave State granted. Wish you all pleasant trip." That telegram was filed with the Western Union Telegraph Company in Columbia at 11:05 a. m., less than an hour after I received the request for permission for this company to leave

the State. As to the time of the delivery and the sending of these telegrams, I have a certificate from Manager Gray, of the Western Union Telegraph Company.

Another newspaper article: In speaking of the encampment matter the *Columbia State* of April 19th says: "Thousands and tens of thousands of dollars will be lost to the people of the State if the Governor, by maintaining his present attitude, shall send the encampment to another State." The editor knew when he was writing this that he was writing an absolute, deliberate lie, but it was anything to hurt Blease. Many of the officials and the best people of the city of Charleston endorsed my stand in the matter, and I have received letters from all over the State commending me for my course. However, this newspaper, in its usual lying manner, tried to make political capital of it, however much by so doing it may have sacrificed the people of the State. But the little trap which they set did not work except to catch themselves.

Still another: *The Columbia Record* in its issue of June 2d, 1914, carried in big headlines: "GOVERNOR GRANTS FORGER A PARDON," and right in the same column under that headline they say: "Robert G. Adams, *alias* S. P. Brooks, of Charleston, convicted at the February, 1913, term of court for Charleston county of forgery, and given a sentence of three years, was paroled." Adams was granted a parole, during good behavior, but he was NOT PARDONED. They had the record right before them, showing that this man was paroled, and not pardoned, but they couldn't help lying, so they said "Governor Grants Forger a Pardon."

And another: *The Columbia Record* of June 2d, 1914, in speaking of the military situation, says: "The Governor stated he would decline to allow the troops to attend the encampment." The Governor has never said, and has not yet said, that the troops would not be allowed to attend the encampment, but has stated that he would withhold his decision in the matter until after the conference at Niagara Falls had reached an agreement, as he thought, and still thinks, the troops should not be allowed to leave the State; for, in case of war with Mexico, they should be mobilized at some point within their own State, and not in some foreign State.

Another instance of a newspaper lie is an article published in United States Marshal Sims' paper, the *Orangeburg Times and Democrat*, of April 7, 1914. Under the heading, "Released Convicts Have Trouble," speaking editorially of a negro by the name of Holman in that county who tried to injure the superintendent of the

chain gang, the paper stated: "With a Governor's favor extended to him for one murder this negro would have known that having killed another he would have been so handled that a pardon from a chicken-hearted Governor would do him no good." As a matter of fact, this negro had received no favor from me, as the editor of this dirty sheet knew. On the contrary, the negro's sentence was reduced from service in the State Penitentiary to service on the county chain gang of Orangeburg county, giving to the county of Orangeburg the benefit of his service on her public highways. This was done upon a petition signed by Robert Lide, Senator; four Representatives from the county, and the County Supervisor. In addition to this petition, there was an affidavit signed by N. N. Hayden, T. J. Bolin, and M. C. Edwins, as supervisors of said county, saying that the chain gang of Orangeburg county was properly equipped with the necessary guards and the necessary paraphernalia to take care of such convicts as the county might work. The editor of this sheet knew that, and yet published this infamous lie to try to injure me in the county of Orangeburg and wherever else his filthy little sheet circulated. I presume that this was in part payment to Senator Smith for having Sims made United States Marshal after his connection with the negro-loving sheet in Kingstree in the days of '76, as heretofore mentioned.

One of Senator Smith's papers down in Sumter county—the *Sumter Daily Item*, a paper published in the county he used to represent in the Legislature—trying to help Smith, published this statement in big headlines, "Double Murder at Rose Hill." After giving the horrible details of the murder, the paper went on to state: "Bob Garrett lived at Dalzell and had been there for several months. He was tried about three years ago for an unmentionable crime and found guilty. He was sentenced to the penitentiary and served two years, when he was pardoned by Governor Blease." This is a most malicious and cowardly lie. I had never heard of Bob Garrett before, and had never pardoned or paroled him, or had anything to do with him, in any manner, shape or form. Now, here is one of his home county papers, publishing this dirty, contemptible lie, trying to make votes for Smith.

NORTHERN NEWSPAPERS SUPPORTING SMITH.

Look at the newspapers in the North and other sections that are supporting Smith, and saying things abusive of me—for instance, the *Wall Street Journal*. Remember, Senator Smith claims to be

fighting Wall Street and doing everything he can to put it out of existence; yet here is what its mouthpiece says—the *Wall Street Journal*: "Governor Cole. Blease says he is standing on his dignity; must have a hard time keeping his feet."

Another Yankee Republican newspaper, speaking of me: "The Governor's act can hardly be called surprising, as there seems to be a natural affinity between popular ignorance and such an executive. When he passes from office he can start the educational ball rolling."

Collier's Weekly says: "Bleasism hinders enlightenment and ignorance fosters Bleasism." This is another Yankee Republican newspaper.

The *New York Sun*, the leading Republican newspaper of this nation, the bitterest of the bitter against the South, writing of this election, says: "South Carolina, like the rest of the country, is tired of Blease. He is a fire-eating mountebank, and should be retired."

The *New York Times*, another one of these papers, published a letter purporting to be from me, leaving out very material parts of it, and made dirty and filthy comments in reference to the same, and when I wrote them and asked them if they had all the letter and why they refused to use it, stating that they had done me a grave injustice, they did not make any effort to correct it. Why? Because they are for Smith. The part of the letter which they left out reads as follows: "If I can serve the Democratic party, either National or State, at any time or in any place or on any occasion, being a Democrat who has never been a fence-straddler and has always voted the straight Democratic ticket, and always ready and willing and pleased to stand by the old-line Jeffersonian Democracy, it will always give me pleasure to advocate those principles, and if I can serve your committee in any manner, shape or form along these lines I will be pleased to do so." This letter was addressed to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, but was so twisted by this Yankee paper as to leave out this part which I have quoted you, endeavoring to make it appear that I was not supporting President Wilson.

The *New York Sun*, again, says: "The first good news that has come from South Carolina concerning Cole. Blease is that in which the defeat of a majority of his candidates for the State Convention is recorded. This convention will write the rules for the primaries in which a Democratic candidate for United States Senator will be chosen. Those regulations will be drawn by the political opponents of Blease and they promise to eliminate him as a serious factor from

the contest." How did this Republican sheet know that "Those regulations will be drawn by the political opponents of Blease and they promise to eliminate him as a serious factor from the contest?" You see that it was done; so, somebody must have given this Republican sheet information that this effort was going to be made to deprive my friends of voting in the primary, by these new, underhanded, mean, contemptible rules for enrollment.

Why are these newspapers fighting me and supporting Smith? Why the comment which I have quoted from Wall Street's mouth-piece, if Senator Smith is not their friend? Why should this Yankee Republican paper, the representative of the autocrats and the corporations, be striking at me, in Smith's interest, if Smith is not their friend? I could cite you to hundreds of instances of this kind, but only call attention to these few to let you know the element of papers supporting Smith outside of South Carolina.

He puts the support of the newspaper ahead of the support of the people who elected him to office. Listen to a card from him published in the *Columbia State* on Wednesday morning, September 9th, 1908, just after his election six years ago: "Allow me to express my grateful appreciation to YOU and to the PEOPLE for the splendid support given me." Not to the PEOPLE and to YOU, but to YOU and the PEOPLE.

When did these papers get to be such great friends of Smith? Probably this *Wall Street Journal* and other papers came to be great friends of his after he attended a banquet on Wall Street which was tendered him by his crowd after his election six years ago, and after he delivered an address at this banquet. Was it this speech that made him so many friends among this class of newspapers, and did this explain why he was quiet for so long a time in the United States Senate? These questions are for you to answer, my friends.

COTTON TRANSACTIONS.

In the *Congressional Record* of September 1st, in a debate between Senator Smith and Senator Simmons, of North Carolina, in speaking of cotton futures, we find Mr. Simmons says:

"I do not profess to understand it."

"Mr. Smith: The Senator is demonstrating that he does not."

"Mr. Simmons: The Senator had experience and does know a great deal about it."

Did his dealing in futures, his transactions with Wall Street and the New York Cotton Exchange, give him this experience, or was Senator Simmons merely guessing?

Could it be possible that while he was running around the country telling other people to hold cotton, that he was selling his at Lynchburg as fast as he could get it out of his farm? Or could it be possible that while he was running around cursing Wall Street and telling other people to hold their cotton, that as matter of fact he was dealing with the New York Exchange, and that he himself was one of their customers? What was it that all at once made these people such friends of his—these people who are now clamoring for his re-election to the Senate—this farmer boy, who has worked so hard on a farm all his life, plowed so many days and hoed cotton and corn so many days? My friends, it is amusing. Get the Senator to tell you how long it has been since he plowed or hoed, or if he ever did.

Isn't it strange, if Senator Smith is such an enemy of the cotton mill owners and mill merger officials and cotton buyers, that some of them are trying to raise a campaign fund to be used for his re-election? Isn't it strange that their papers are all fighting and begging for the re-election of Smith? Is it because he fought so stubbornly to have Weston, the corporation attorney and stockholder, appointed United States District Attorney? However, isn't it still more strange that the very people who were clamoring for his defeat six years ago, and endeavoring to beat him, and the very people Smith was going around over the State abusing—these newspapers and great corporations—are now hollering for Smith, and on these, his once enemies, as he denounced them, he is now depending for his re-election? What has he done to make such great friends out of his once enemies? Where is the bill that he has introduced, with his name to it, that has been of any benefit to the people of this State or of this nation? Six years ago he got on a bale of cotton, put a pair of spurs on his feet, took a twine string and tied it around the end of the bale of cotton for his bridle reins, and whooped and hollered and rode into the Senate denouncing and abusing the very men and the very newspapers that are today clamoring for his election. What has he done to win such favoritism from his once bitter enemies? Appointing Weston United States District Attorney? Appointing Gonzales to Cuba? Appointing Editor Sims United States Marshal? What farmer has he endorsed for United States Marshal, for Interstate Commerce Commissioner,

for Collector of Internal Revenue, for Collector of Customs at any South Carolina port, or any other office in South Carolina, except some little country postoffice that a farmer had to hold because he happened to be a country merchant and farmer both? What has he done for you farmers? When he wanted a secretary, did he take a farmer boy? No. In his speech at Walterboro he said that lawyers were unfit to legislate for farmers, yet he has a lawyer for his private secretary, who is the son of a lawyer. Why didn't he get some practical farmer for his private secretary, who could give him suggestions? Oh, no! His first secretary was the union labor scab. He couldn't even find a farmer then. His second private secretary, after he had had this union labor scab made civil service commissioner, is a lawyer.

Senator Smith says that in making his appointments he has tried to serve all the people to the best of his ability, and that he has never stopped to inquire whether a man was his "friend" or his "enemy" or whether a man had voted for him or not. You will find this in his little book entitled, "A Few Facts Concerning His Record." Did he inquire whether Weston and Sims and Heyward and Gonzales and the others he has given jobs to were his friends? Ah! gentlemen, it is too thin. Of course, he knew where they stood. If he did not, it certainly is most peculiar that no one has received anything from him except who was his friend. This, I presume, he will hardly deny. He should stand by his friends. I certainly do, but his "Few Facts Concerning His Record" should not be misleading or state false facts.

THE IMMIGRATION QUESTION.

In the County Democratic Convention, held in the county of Newberry on May 8th, 1906, I introduced the following resolution, which was adopted by that convention:

"Resolved, That we request the Immigrant Agent of South Carolina and those interesting themselves in securing immigrants for this country, to be careful in the selection of whom they locate here in our State and county, as we do not wish all classes of people who are looking to be located.

"Resolved, further, That we beg of our landowners to be careful of as to whom they sell their real estate to, so that our country may not fall into the hands of a race and color that may be injurious to our own home people."

I followed this up with an argument in which I said:

"We want a desirable class of immigrants, but judging from the appearance, we did not want the kind of immigrants which had lately been settling in our country," referring to an undesirable class who had been brought here.

And in the campaign of 1908, when I was a candidate for Governor, in my platform announcing my candidacy, and in my opening speech, which can be found printed in the papers of that date, I said, in reference to immigration:

"I am opposed to the present method of securing immigrants to our State. While I believe in keeping open doors for that class of people who want to come among us, who are able to come, and show evidence of thrift and good character, yet I am absolutely opposed to paying the way of people here who are worthless, refuse to work, and become loafers around our towns and cities, to the detriment of our own people, and those who are willing to underbid our people and take from them their labor, or are willing to become tools in the hands of corporations to help force our own people to work for prices lower than the labor is worth to the employer, thereby depriving our own people of what is theirs and putting them at the mercy of the capitalists, who are seeking the cheapest labor they can get to do their work."

That was my position then. That is my position now. And as Governor this has been the principle upon which I have worked.

Senator Smith is chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration, and in a position where he could have been of much service to the people of this State and of this nation, had he given his time and attention to this subject, and by so doing he would have been of far more real benefit to the farmers of this country, and particularly of this State, than has been all his wild talk about cotton, while other people were fixing up the bills and getting them through. Yet, never a bill put through by him to check this riff-raff from other countries from coming here in competition with our own people, and working for a low, miserable wage that our people cannot live on. This riff-raff makes low wages and makes it harder upon the people of our State and our nation. Yet this great chairman of this committee has had no law passed, notwithstanding the Democratic party has now been in power for a year and a half. And, I know of my own

personal knowledge, that representatives of the laboring people have been in person to Washington to see him, and begging him to push a bill along this line, to give them relief, and I also know that members of a certain order have been writing and wiring, begging his help and begging him to get a bill to relieve the situation on immigration. I know it further to be a fact that strong appeals have been made to another Senator, begging him to come to their assistance and go to Senator Smith and ask him to help them; but, instead of helping them, what do we find? We find him doing nothing to give the much-needed relief, but is continuing to allow, by his do-nothing policy, and by his failure to take up this bill and push it, as it is his duty to do, immigrants to flood our country, as the following statement shows:

"Immigrants arrived at American ports at the rate of more than 2,900 every week day during the first ten months of the fiscal year of 1913-14 and indications are that by June 30, when the fiscal year ends, the greatest number of immigrants ever admitted during any year will have entered. Statistics of the Bureau of Immigration for April and the ten months ending with April show 119,885 were admitted in April and the total for the ten months was 1,036,955. Should May and June arrivals equal the number admitted during those months in previous years the 1914 total would be approximately 1,351,000. The greatest number of arrivals in one year heretofore was 1,285,349 in 1907."

Congressman Burnett, Chairman of the House Immigration Committee, had his bill passed February 4th, 1914, while Smith is allowing his bill to still sleep in his committee. Burnett's bill came to the Senate on February 5th. On March 12th it was ordered reported, but Smith did not report it until March 19th—thus losing a week, notwithstanding the fact that this bill passed the House with a prestige of two to one vote. Over four months have passed and he has done nothing. It is true he has made two fake attempts to get it up, but by reference to the *Congressional Record*, you will see that they were both jokes and were so treated by the other Senators. However, it is not attempts that pay in the Senate—it is results that count. Smith promised Secretary Morrison, of the American Federation of Labor, and President Gompers that he would get the bill through before the middle of May; and, I am also informed that he promised Mr. Noyes, Representative of the Junior Order, that he

would rush it through; and, I am informed that Messrs. Morrison, Noyes and Gompers are all disgusted with Smith's actions.

POSTOFFICES AND POST ROADS.

When I am elected to the United States Senate I shall make special efforts to have the postoffices and post roads of our rural districts improved, so as to make it not only easier and more convenient to deliver to our people their mail, but also for the purpose of giving a quicker and more rapid delivery, and I will also put forth every effort to increase the salaries of the carriers, who are called upon to perform these duties for the benefit of the people of the rural districts of our State.

Mr. Smith is a member of the committee on Postoffices and Post Roads, being the second man on it, and could have been of very great service to his State had he put his efforts forward in this direction. But he has seemed to have lost sight entirely of this fact, and has done nothing except to leave negroes and Republicans as postmasters, mail carriers, etc. What has he done for the people of this State along this line, and particularly what has he done for the R. F. D. carriers of this State?

I would like for Mr. Smith to explain to you what has become of Shackleford Good Roads Bill appropriating twenty-five million dollars annually, to be turned over to State and local authorities for improving roads, used by rural route carriers and free rural delivery. As I understand it, this bill is still sleeping in his committee. We would like for him to explain this bill and explain to the farmers of this country why it has been sleeping for so long in the committee, of which he is a member and could easily fought for and insisted upon its passage. If it is a good bill, we should have it; and if not, why is it dying and sleeping so quietly in the committee?

DRAINAGE AND DEEPER WATERWAYS.

I will also use my best efforts to get a bill through, or such legislation as is necessary, to help drain the lowlands of our State. Irrigation in the West, by assistance of the National Government, has reclaimed many, many acres of land, which are today very valuable for all purposes, and it seems to me that it is nothing but fair and just, if this is to go on in the West all the time, that the people of the South, who pay their proportionate share of the taxes, should have appropriations made to assist them in irrigating their lowlands also.

I heard much in Senator Smith's campaign six years ago, and in newspaper articles by him about the draining of our lowlands, but so far I have failed to see where he has made any effort to carry out his promises along this line. However, in the House, in 1900, when we were endeavoring to get through an act for drainage purposes, Mr. Smith voted against it and caused its defeat—see page 558, House Journal of 1900. Eighty-one members voted for its passage, and it lacked only two votes of being passed; but, Mr. Smith, being one of a small majority who voted against it, and it requiring a two-thirds vote, it failed of passage.

I will also favor appropriations for deeper waterways; for cleaning out our streams; make the deeper, and providing channels sufficient to allow boats to navigate them, which I feel the National Government owes to this country, and have already too long neglected the opportunities which are here for them and for us. Along this line, I have been fighting ever since I have been Governor, endeavoring to protect the streams and to prevent private individuals from taking charge of the water, which belongs to the people at large, and turning it into private uses to enrich corporations.

NEGROES.

I shall, right at the beginning of my term as Senator, introduce a bill providing that it shall be a felony for any white person to marry a negro anywhere in the United States, and will do everything within my power to secure its passage, and fight for it continuously until it becomes a law.

While we have some States that have laws on this subject, it has now reached that point where it should be a National question and forced upon our statute books, because it is becoming to be a very serious problem throughout this whole country; and, how long it will be before some negro with his white wife comes into South Carolina, our own State, or some white woman with her negro husband, and demands, under our laws, protection as man and wife, we do not know, but when it does happen, we should be in a position to defend ourselves against it without having to appeal to force.

FOR SEPARATION OF THE RACES.

I will also introduce a bill, and fight for its passage, requiring separate coaches for white people and negroes on all railroad trains, Pullman cars, electric cars and street railways. This will relieve the situation in Washington, D. C., where a great many Southern

people go and are oftentimes very much humiliated by being placed in awkward positions in riding on cars on account of the negro having the same equal right with the white people of this country. And, in this connection, I would like to ask what effort, if any, has Senator Smith made to get such a bill passed during his term of service.

What effort has Senator Smith made to get a law through to prevent white people from marrying negroes, or to segregate the negroes on railroad trains and elsewhere, particularly on the street cars in the city of Washington? All that we have heard from Senator Smith is "That he sho 'Do Rant' " on "COTTON," "COTTON."

I wish to repeat once again that I am not attempting to dictate whom the people of South Carolina shall elect to any office or offices. I have set out before you today the records and the facts, just as they appeared and just as they now appear. I have not dealt in personalities; neither do I expect to. Some things that I have said may look personal, but they are simply the records as recorded. I shall not resort to any personal debates unless I am attacked personally, but on the contrary, I shall confine myself strictly to matters political and political records. But if my personal reputation is attacked, as it has been in the past, I propose to reply and strike back in like manner.

THE PEOPLE ARE THE JUDGES.

I leave to the people the selection of their officers, national, State and county. I have friends in the various races, and as between those friends, I shall not take any active part, and rumors and reports that you hear that Blease is fighting for this man or for that man you my put absolutely no confidence in it at all; but, I shall fight for, stand by and vote for my friends in every race.

In this connection, no doubt you have noticed the editorials and other articles in the newspapers, which are now being printed commending Senator Tillman for his wisdom and statesmanship in interfering in State politics at this time. I have no objection to Mr. Tillman's interference, but in order to keep the records straight I quote you here a few editorials on Mr. Tillman's past interference in races in South Carolina:

The *Columbia State* of July 9th, 1906, says:

"If orders of Boss Ben are obeyed every man who voted for the Morgan bill in house and senate will be defeated for re-election this year. For a tenth as much interference in State affairs when Senator, Hampton was dragged from the United States

Senate by Tillman's command. We ask the people to look on that picture, then look on this and judge of the value and sincerity of Tillman leadership."

And further, in the same issue, they say:

"When in the course of time and by process of natural events the people of South Carolina are deprived of the guiding hand of Ben Tillman, what will become of them? South Carolinians cannot manage their local affairs without him. Inevitably the demnition bow-wows will get the State when Boss Ben is gone."

In this same issue they have seven articles on Mr. Tillman, another being:

"The members of the House of Representatives refused to be the servants of Senator Tillman—and that is the *casus belli*."

In their issue of July 11th, 1906, they devote a two-column editorial to abuse of Senator Tillman for his interference in the Attorney General's race. Of course, now, as he is on their side, it is all right for him to do what they so bitterly condemned him for helping defeat Hampton for.

On August 4th, 1906, editorially, they say: "None of the grafters will vote for Fraser Lyon."—*Kingstree County Record*. "Now isn't it queer that among those that will cast their ballots against Fraser Lyon is the Hon. Benjamin Ryan Tillman?"—*The State*.

Tillman, in speaking of *The State*, as reported by them, August 6th, 1906, said:

"In answer Tillman took *The State* in his hand and said: 'If any man reads this and don't go to the asylum and become a donkey, I swear to God he'll learn to bray.'" Tillman's opinion of *The State* then, when they were blistering him almost daily for his interference in State politics.

The Columbia *State* of Monday morning, August 9th, 1906, said:

"Will Senator Tillman, who is fighting for the really corrupting influences in our politics, make answer? Will he who condemns legislators who happen to stand with *The State*, accuse them of being controlled by this paper, make excuse from the great and harmful influence of the dispensary?"

Note the remark: "WILL SENATOR TILLMAN, WHO IS FIGHTING FOR THE REALLY CORRUPTING INFLU-

ENCES IN OUR POLITICS." Quite different from what they say he is fighting for now. And, in those days they printed the most ridiculous and damaging cartoons of Senator Tillman.

In this issue of August 13th, 1906, under the head, "Tillman Tells About Rebates," they take up a column or more in their abuse of him, and wind up by saying: "Senator Tillman admitted under oath that the rebates were not his, yet he gave them away."

In speaking of him on August 16th, 1906, the *Columbia State* said:

"He is an interested advocate, influenced by deep prejudice, and unfit for safe leadership." Yet today they praise him as their greatest of leaders.

CONDEMNATION CHANGED TO PRAISE.

At the same time, on August 17th, 1906, *The State* said of Senator Francis H. Weston:

"We surmise that Mr. Weston is wakeful, planning to be elected to the Senate on the dispensary platform. He and many others have turned to the dispensary since that institution has become thoroughly corrupt. The State is now just where it was in 1894. Those who have deserted our camp are heartily welcome to their new bed-fellows and the fleas."

Yet this is the same Mr. Weston that this same editor endorsed and helped to be District Attorney.

On August 23d, 1906, the *Columbia State*, speaking editorially, said:

"When Senator Tillman, standing on the capitol steps in Columbia, said, 'If you don't like my style, don't vote for me,' he might have expected that a good many who do not like his style of meddling with South Carolina affairs would take his advice. And the only way in which the individual can register his disapproval is by scratching the name on the ballot."

Now they holler, "Help us, Tillman, or we sink." Then they were condemning him for interfering.

Again, on August 24th, 1906, they said:

"Scratching Tillman's name off the ballot will not mean a censure of Tillman as Senator, but it will mean a rebuke to Tillman; it will mean censure for his disregard of public opinion; it will mean that good people object to the bad style he adopts in this State."

On August 25th, 1906, they asked, in speaking of Senator Tillman:

"It is reported that he paid Hubbel way above current prices. Will he produce the figures, or shall we do so?"

On Monday, August 27th, 1906, they published a most slanderous and ridiculous cartoon of Senator Tillman, along with a very dirty editorial, headed, "More Than Rebates," winding up the editorial with the sentence: "Had another so profited Tillman would have called it graft, with a big G and a double damn. And it was."

On August 28th, 1906, the *Columbia State* published another, if possible, more damaging and scurrilous cartoon of Senator Tillman, and in winding up their article they said:

"We dared question Senator Tillman's right to dictate measures for South Carolinians to adopt or to prescribe men who offered for public office, and so Tillman and every tool he has brought into service have made us their target. But we have been honored by their vindictiveness and strengthened in the estimation of the great and growing decent element in South Carolina."

The editor of this paper is the man that is sent as Minister to Cuba.

I could go on and on, my fellow citizens, but time and space will not permit. I only quote these few extracts to show you what these people thought of Tillman when he was attempting to dictate against the men that this crowd favored, and what they think of him now when he is attempting to dictate for the men they favor. When he is against them, it is very, very ugly for him to try to dictate to the people who they should vote for, but when he is for their candidate, then he is right, and by all means should dictate to his people.

I have served my people as Mayor, Legislator, Senator and Governor, and I have not and never expect to attempt to dictate to them who they shall vote for, but present my own claims. They have endorsed my record in the House by electing me to the Senate, and endorsed me as Senator, by electing me Mayor, and endorsed me in my entire public service by electing me Governor, and re-electing me for a second term; and, I herewith quote you some resolutions which have been passed, showing what the laboring people think of me and my work in their behalf:

RESOLUTIONS BY THE LABORING PEOPLE.

Columbia, S. C., December 16th, 1913.

Hon. Cole. L. Blease, Governor of the State of South Carolina.

Dear Sir: You will find enclosed a copy of the resolutions that was passed by this body; and in sending this to you, we believe you can do more good in preventing convicts competing with free labor. We know you have done organized labor more good and assisted them, than all the Governors in the last twenty-five years. We trust you will give this resolution due consideration; and assuring you of our best wishes, we beg to remain,

COLUMBIA BUILDING TRADES COUNCIL,

Geo. Nafey, Secretary.

Columbia, S. C., November 21st, 1913.

The following resolution was passed by the Building Trades Council at their regular meeting November 7th, 1913:

"Whereas, The State of South Carolina is preparing to engage in the manufacturing of furniture by convict labor, in direct competition with free labor; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Building Trades Council of Columbia, S. C., do enter this as their protest, against the State entering into a contract with any person, firm, or corporation, for the purpose of marketing their goods in competition with free labor. Be it further

"Resolved, That we solicit the aid of all citizens who have the interest of the State of South Carolina at heart, to abolish such conditions, that will put a blot on the fair name of our State. Be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Governor of South Carolina, and also a copy to each of the daily newspapers; and a copy be spread on the minutes of the Building Trades Council.

A. W. MORGAN,

H. H. KEENE,

GEO. NAFEY,

Committee."

(Seal)

December 18, 1913.

Mr. George Nafey, Secretary Building Trades Council, Columbia, S. C.

Dear Sir: Your letter of December 16, enclosing resolutions of your body, has been received. I did not know there would be any objection to the class of work mentioned, which these men are doing. As I understand it, it is kind of a novelty in this State, and

they are not making a class of goods made anywhere else in the State. The contract is not final, but is subject to revision by the Legislature, and as matter of fact, according to my understanding, was made to fill in until the matter could be determined by the Legislature, in order to keep these people busy.

If, after thorough investigation, you find it is against the interests of the laboring people, I will lend you my assistance to help you defeat it before the Legislature. I thank you very much indeed for the high compliment you pay me. I am glad that I have been able to be of service to my friends, the laboring people, and hope to be able to continue to be of service to them.

Very respectfully,

COLE. L. BLEASE, Governor.

Columbia, S. C., February 19, 1914.

To His Excellency, Cole. L. Blease, Governor of South Carolina.

Dear Sir: The Building Trades Council of this city, in a resolution passed last night, wish to extend to you their sincere thanks in you signing the bill for the regulating and installing of sanitary plumbing in this State. We are glad to know that we have a Chief Executive who is always willing to help the citizens of this State in a measure for the protection of their health; and also one who is fearless in the discharge of his duty towards the workingman.

Assuring you of our appreciation and support, we beg to remain,

Very respectfully yours,

R. A. WILLIAMS, President;

G. W. ARNOLD,

A. M. CAMP,

Columbia Building Trades Council.

Columbia, S. C., February 21, 1914.

To His Excellency, Cole. L. Blease, Governor of South Carolina

Dear Sir: At a regular meeting of the Plumbers' and Steam-Fitters' Local Union No. 227, the following resolution was adopted:

That we extend a vote of thanks to you for signing the bill to secure the registration of Plumbers and the supervision and inspection of plumbing and drainage.

We are proud to know that the State of South Carolina has a Chief Executive who is always ready to assist the people of our State in a sanitary measure, and sincerely hope to see you in a higher office, knowing that we will have one who will always be ready to help the working people of our State.

Assuring you of our appreciation and earnest support, we beg to remain,

J. A. REDMOND, President,
T. W. TOMPKINS, Rec. Sec.,
W. M. LANAHAN, Asst. Sec.,
Local Union No. 227.

(Seal)

Columbia, S. C., March 10, 1914.

To His Excellency, the Governor, and Through Him, the Senate and House of Representatives of South Carolina:

The "City Federation of Trades" at its last meeting, by unanimous vote, directed that its full appreciation and most sincere thanks be expressed for the passage and signing of such bills as were designed for the interest of the mechanic and laborer.

To His Excellency, gratitude for promptly attaching his signature and thereby enacting into law those bills; and to the Senate and House of Representatives, most sincere appreciation and good will for the recognition and aid in the effort of the "City Federation of Trades" to promote equity and justice on the part of and for the workingman.

S. B. KIRBY,
O. W. WOLF,
A. A. GERALD,
WM. H. WELLS,
Committee.

RESOLUTIONS.

Whereas, His Excellency, Governor Cole. L. Blease, so generously and with that characteristic vigor and power, supported the measures and bills presented at the last General Assembly for the betterment of the working men and especially the Motormen and Conductors; therefore be it

Resolved, That our Order express their appreciation and affection for OUR GOVERNOR for all of his noble deeds and especially for this noble support.

Second, That a page of our minute book be inscribed to him in token of our gratitude and that a copy of these resolutions be presented to Hon. Cole. L. Blease, the Man.

J. W. BALLENTINE,
Secretary.

A. A. GERALD,
President.

S. J. WESSINGER,
WM. M. JACOBS,
R. F. MARTIN,
T. B. SOX,

Executive Committee.

April, 1914.

In addition to these, I have hundreds of letters, from all parts of the State, congratulating and thanking me for service to them, and particularly for assisting them in having passed laws which have proved beneficial to them; endorsing my course in the Aiken-Augusta trolley-line strike, and the Spartanburg and Charleston, and Columbia street car strikes, and other acts that have proven beneficial to my people. Yet, now and then, you see where some little fice-barking editor says, "Blease is not a friend to the laboring man." Thank God, Blease has never joined with negroes, Republicans, Haskellites, Cubans and Populists and helped to pass rules that would keep the laboring man from voting in the primary, or elsewhere, and he never will, whatever may be the consequences or the results.

They curse me for standing by my friends. Has Senator Smith appointed any man to any office in this State, or attempted to get any man appointed to any office in this State, who was my friend? Why is it that every one of his appointees have been men who were mixed up with the Haskell movement in this State? Yes, I stand by my friends, and I intend to continue to do so, and I thank all of my friends for what they have done for me, and will continue to serve them in the future, as I have done in the past and am doing now, faithfully and to their best interest. For,

"OF WHAT SHALL A MAN BE PROUD,
IF HE IS NOT PROUD OF HIS FRIENDS."

OTHER SPEECHES.

During the summer I delivered numbers of addresses at various places throughout the State, speaking upon such questions and issues as were brought before the people of South Carolina.

The financial crisis began to arrive, but we were led to believe that we were in absolutely no danger, it being held out to us as a positive fact that if a certain candidate was endorsed in the primary for the United States Senate, that the price of cotton would go up, and he himself held out that he had gone to Washington and had a conference with certain parties—among them being Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo—and that under the new currency law a sufficient amount of money would be furnished by the United States government to market the cotton crop at a favorable price. This statement was made from the public rostrum, after the said conference

was stated to have been held in the city of Washington, on a certain Sabbath day.

A stenographic report of his statement regarding the Washington conference on the cotton situation follows, as reported in the *News and Courier* of August 11, 1914:

"JUST BACK FROM WASHINGTON.

"I wish that at my county seat I felt more like making a speech than I do today. On last Saturday I spoke at Darlington. Saturday night I went to Washington in order to meet with those who had the power to relieve the terrible situation that confronts, primarily and first, the cotton and tobacco growers in South Carolina. I left there at 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon and came on here this morning, so that you can imagine my physical condition. I want to make this observation: Never in the history of the world, never before in the history of civilization, has such a condition confronted the human race. The great Powers of Europe, after all of these years of Christian civilization, are at each other's throats in a death grapple to maintain their own domain and to make aggression into the domain of others. Never before have we had brought home to us so powerfully that we are interdependent from ocean to ocean, from pole to pole and from the equator around.

"NO TIME TO PLAY POLITICS.

"Therefore, this is no time for any man or any set of men to play politics. There confronts those who produce the clothing and foods of the peoples of the earth a disastrous condition, which may lead to bankruptcy. Their loved ones may not be killed by the bullet or mangled by the engines of warfare, but in the reaction of these conditions in Europe there is pending danger to us as disastrous as the hum of the bullet. It was into that breach that I conceived it to be my duty to throw myself, for you had elected me to the Senate by the biggest majority that you had ever given a man—I say it was into this breach that I threw whatever brain I had and whatever education I had, and for nine years I have used whatever abilities I may have to help the man who feeds the world, clothes the world and shoes the world; used whatever powers I may have possessed to see that he did not go hungry, barefooted and naked.

"LET THE HEATHEN RAGE.

"They charge that I have spent five and a half years of my career pleading for legislation for the farmers. I want to state to this

audience that I shall let the heathen rage and the people in high places imagine vain things, for I believe that the hope and salvation of this nation is upon the independent, progressive, energetic, educated, progressive farmers of the country, and I have no apologies to make for having labored for them.

"Therefore, the greatest compliment that has been paid me as your Senator is the fact that in this grave crisis there came to me from every cotton growing State the plea for Ed Smith to throw himself into the breach and once again stem the tide that threatened the farmers of the South, and I would rather successfully respond to that call than to respond to the majority of the votes in South Carolina and go back to the Senate.

"PLEADED FOR UNISON.

"Therefore, I answered that call by wiring last week. First, let me say, I met with a few men in Columbia, and we went over the situation. I told them that this was not a time for politics, for the man who would try to make political capital out of so serious a condition is unworthy of being a man. I pleaded that we lay aside all political differences in South Carolina. I tell you today that I care not whether you wear the cotton bloom or the red badge—I am going to do as much for you who do wear the red badge as for the boys who wear the cotton bloom. Thank God, you can wear no badge in South Carolina that will keep Ed Smith from helping those who are not in a position to help themselves.

"I sent a telegram to the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. John Skelton Williams, and asked him if he could meet me Sunday morning. I did not consider it any desecration for me to call together Senators and Representatives from the Southern States on the Sabbath, when the Master taught good will toward men. I called them on the Sabbath day. In response to that telegram I got favorable answers.

"MET LEADERS IN TRAIN.

"Before I got to Washington, to my gratification, the Comptroller of the Currency, the man in whose hand rests the great finances of America, boarded the train at Richmond. He came into my berth and from there to Washington we talked over the situation. I found Mr. Harding, a member of the Federal Reserve Board, the man who is to put into operation our new law, at my office, and I outlined what I wanted to him. To my great gratification there

came representative men from Louisiana, Alabama, from others of the cotton growing States. There were also present manufacturers of cotton, warehousemen. After we had discussed the situation, I asked the direct question if it were possible to put into operation our new law and let Richmond, which is to be the central point for the finances of the South, if we could not let Richmond go into operation. I was informed that it would be impossible to get this regional center into operation within the next ninety days. I said we must have a law which will relieve this situation and let the Treasurer of the United States come to the rescue of those who fill the treasury. THEY INFORMED ME THAT CONGRESS HAD JUST PASSED AN AMENDMENT TO THE VREELAND-ALDRICH CURRENCY LAW, AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO ISSUE ONE BILLION DOLLARS IN ADDITION TO WHAT WE HAVE AND TO USE IT IN MOVING THE CROPS. I ASKED HOW THIS WAS TO BE DONE.

"WANTS MONEY FOR SMALL BANKS.

"The point that I wanted to bring out and get the promise that it would be worked out, if possible, was not to have the treasury to send this money to the central national banks, like Spartanburg, Greenville, Columbia and Charleston alone, but to make arrangements to send that money direct to our small State banks and let them give as collateral security, against the issuance of that currency, cotton; let the man with one bale of cotton bring it up to his little town, go to his little bank, take his receipt for this cotton, properly insured and stored, and get the money he needs on it right at his home. I told them it was impracticable and no use to talk about the average farmer sending his cotton to Columbia, to Charleston, and storing it. So I said to the committee, 'Let's get down to brass tacks. It is no use to sit down here and spin your courthouse theories. What the boy in the field wants is something that he can lay his hands on without going to a half dozen so-called experts. I told them that the rank and file of the farmers of this country are just as honest as the best man you have in the Treasury.

"COTTON AS COLLATERAL.

"I told them that what I wanted was that the Treasury of the United States, the Comptroller, should recommend an immediate amendment to the Vreeland-Aldrich Bill, giving the Secretary of the

Treasury the right to send to any bank that will accept cotton paper as collateral against a loan from the Treasury, such money as may be needed and as may be properly secured in such manner, and that there shall not be charged any more interest than prescribed by that Bill, and that the amendment shall fix the rate of interest at just enough to cover the transportation of the money, and the fixing of the necessary papers. THE LAST WORD ASKED ME YESTERDAY, WHEN THE MEETING WAS ABOUT TO ADJOURN, WAS BY THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY. 'NOW, SENATOR,' HE SAID, 'WHAT IS IT THAT YOU WANT?' I SAID, 'I WANT MONEY ENOUGH TO HOLD EVERY BALE OF COTTON UNTIL THE MARKETS ARE OPEN AGAIN AND THE TRADE RESUMES ITS NORMAL CONDITION. I WANT THAT MONEY PUT WHERE IT CAN GET RIGHT IN TOUCH WITH THE MAN WHO MAKES THE COTTON.'

"PROMPT ACTION PROMISED.

"THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY PROMISED ME THAT HE WOULD GO YESTERDAY AFTERNOON, ALTHOUGH THE MOTHER-IN-LAW OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY WAS DEAD, AND HOLD A CONFERENCE WITH THE SECRETARY; THAT THEY WOULD GO OVER THE VREELAND-ALDRICH ACT TOGETHER AND THE AMENDMENT THAT HAD RECENTLY BEEN PUT ONTO IT, AND THAT IF THEY COULD NOT FIND A WAY UNDER THIS ACT WHEREBY THEY COULD SEND THIS MONEY TO THE LOCAL BANKS, THAT IF SUCH POWER DID NOT LIE IN THE LAW THAT THEY WOULD RECOMMEND AN AMENDMENT FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION. SENATOR OVERMAN, SENATOR SIMMONS, SENATOR RANDELL AND SENATOR HOKE SMITH, OF GEORGIA, ALL PLEDGED ME THAT WHEN THIS REPORT WAS MADE TODAY, IF AN AMENDMENT WERE RECOMMENDED TO CARRY OUT WHAT I PLEADED FOR YESTERDAY, THAT THEY WOULD INTRODUCE IT IN THE SENATE AND SEE THAT IT WAS INTRODUCED IN THE HOUSE SIMULTANEOUSLY AND RUSH IT THROUGH SO THAT THE MONEY COULD BE AVAILABLE WHEN THE COTTON STARTED TO MOVE.

"You will recall that last year, upon the suggestion of some of us, the Secretary of the Treasury sent down here money to help move the crop. Now the conditions are the reverse, we want money to keep the crop from moving, and I have no doubt whatever that within the next few days we shall have adequate and convenient means by which the farmers of this country, the cotton farmers, and the tobacco farmers as well, shall be enabled to get a profitable return for the wealth they produce."

MY REPLY.

I stated then that it could not be true, and that it was done for the purpose of deceiving the people of the State—that the United States Congress could not or would not give the relief which our people would be forced to have, because the South was only a portion of this nation, and cotton was not the only crop of the nation, and that the Senators and members of the National House of Representatives from other portions of the United States would not submit to the United States government furnishing the money to purchase millions of bales of cotton, or lending money with which to purchase it. My prediction, as every sensible man knew then, was true, and subsequent events have proven it to be true.

We were told by this same party what great things would be done under the currency law. I said in my speeches, particularly the one at Dillion, that the national currency law would be used, just as all other laws of the National government along this line had been used—for the benefit of the favorites; that is, the National Administration in power would let the money out of the Treasury and lend it to banks that were favorites of the administration, and that the banks which received the money would lend it in their respective communities to their favorites and friends. This has come to pass, and has been shown to be positively true. But at the time I was held up in ridicule and was accused of being an enemy of the present National Administration and fighting it; yet now they all admit that what I said was true and that they have failed in their promises to the people.

In my speech at Charleston, following the first primary, I said to the people that the Western Senators and members of the National House of Representatives were not going to permit the United States government to do what Senator Smith and his friends and supporters had promised, and that if they were

not careful, instead of carrying out the policies which had been promised the next thing we would hear of would be a demand from other parts of the United States for a tax on cotton. How true was the prophecy! The people who heard the Dillon speech and the Charleston speech will bear witness that I made these prophecies.

I also said in my Charleston speech that the first war tax which would be levied would bear heaviest upon the poor man. How true was this prophecy! The first tax that they want to levy for a war tax is upon the poor man. Thousands of poor people who are unable to go to first-class theaters because of the high prices, spend their few leisure moments as pleasure-seekers in the moving picture shows, at a cost of five or ten cents. But when a war tax is to be raised these poor people's theaters are among the first things that are to be taxed; and along with it comes a tax on the little check that the poor man gets for his money for his hard month's labor, and on the deposit slip that he gives to the bank when he goes to put in his little savings in the saving department of the bank when he is trying to draw a little interest. There are other things which I could enumerate, if it were not for the fact that it would take too much of your time, which show that every dollar of this tax is going to have to be paid by the man who borrows money and the man who does business on a credit. The broker and banker will have to pay his license tax, but of course it comes out of his customer. The man who borrows a little money and gives a mortgage will have to pay a little more in order to pay the tax for the stamp on the mortgage; the poor man who secures a deed will have to pay a little more for the stamp; and so on other papers. And at last, if you will study it, you will see that the whole tax will have to be paid by the laboring man, who is forced to be a patron of the things that the tax is levied upon. And then if they put the two cents tax on the cotton every poor fellow, even he who hoes the cotton or picks it for a small per diem, has to pay his part of the tax.

I said in many speeches that this war would temporarily injure the South, but I pleaded with the farmers to hold what they had and not be deceived into turning it loose, for the time would come when this war, from a commercial standpoint, would be beneficial to the South, and those who survived its hardships would be greatly benefited hereafter. I believe that yet.

POST-ELECTION STATEMENT.

After the first primary, and the Senator to whom I have heretofore referred had been renominated, cotton continued to go lower and no relief came from the United States government. Then it was that the people began to ask for an expression from me. Even the newspaper reporters repeatedly requested that I make a statement.

I issued a statement as follows:

Columbia, S. C., September 5th, 1914.

To My Friends and Supporters:

A due sense of gratitude and thanks to you for your confidence and support, as well as a feeling of propriety upon my part, impels me to make to you a statement, as briefly as I can, with regard to the late primary election for the United States Senate.

As you know, two years ago I made the fight for re-election for Governor without having any financial means to maintain any organized management in my behalf in that campaign, and had to rely entirely upon the voluntary expression of the will of the people in casting their votes at the polls. I was opposed by the organized efforts and the resources of the bankers, manufacturers and corporations, with substantially the entire press of the State lined up against me with the determination to show neither fairness nor justice nor to abate a single effort to misrepresent the true state of the campaign as it progressed, but on the contrary to distort and villify me in every respect. With this combination of press and capital against me I received 72,043 votes, a lead of 5,495 over a man who had been enlisted from his early entrance into public life with the Tillmanite movement, and who had been trained as the candidate in whom the senior Senator from South Carolina and the press placed all of their hope of defeating me. This gentleman had been Speaker of the House of Representatives, had been an Associate Justice upon the Supreme Bench, and had been Chief Justice up to the time he resigned for the purpose of carrying the standard of the trusts, capitalists, corporations, and the press, who had conspired with the determination at all events and under all circumstances to try to perpetuate their control over the politics of South Carolina and select her State officers. Immediately after that election it was announced by the partisan and unscrupulous majority of the State Executive Committee that there were frauds and

wilful irregularities committed in the election which was held under their own management and auspices. I quietly then submitted to the indignities and injustice which were attempted to be perpetrated upon me and the majority of the people of the State.

There were cast in that election for State officers 140,757 votes. It was vehemently asserted by the newspapers and by the members of that Executive Committee who were trying to nullify that primary election that there were not that many qualified white Democratic voters in the State. The proceedings, in the nature of a contest, which were inaugurated by my opponents, under the advice and auspices of the partisan Executive Committee, however, showed conclusively, even by the one-sided and partial examinations made there, that such charge was without foundation, and the contest resulted in a ridiculous farce.

There was evinced in the present election the greatest interest in any election held within the last twenty years or more, and yet the total number of votes as cast for the office of United States Senator, as reported by my opponents in the control of the count, was only 132,801—about 8,000 less than were cast in the election of 1912. The iniquitous and unfair rules passed by the State Democratic Convention of last May, which was entirely in control of my adversaries, were intended to disfranchise the uneducated, but poor and honest white men who were supposed to be, and I believe were, to a very large extent, my friends and supporters. These rules made it not only difficult and inconvenient, but humiliating, for them to enroll their names upon the club lists to which they belonged. Yet there were enrolled upon the club lists of the State 154,311 qualified voters, as reported under the management of my opponents. Out of that number at the last primary the returning boards for the several counties—nearly all of whom were under the absolute control of my opponents, who did not permit or allow any representative or adherents of mine to be appointed or to engage in the conduct of this election—returned only 132,801 votes, being 21,510 votes less than the qualified voters enrolled and appearing upon the club lists. After such a campaign as we had how is the absence of these votes to be accounted for? In two years' time many young men became entitled to vote, and in my opinion did vote. I ask, how can these results be

explained? Certainly not by any action of my friends and supporters in counting the votes.

Any fair-minded person desiring to know the truth cannot fail to recognize that there is something wrong. Examine the votes of Charleston, Columbia and other towns and it is evident who controlled and obtained the votes of the blind tigers and the dispensary followers. With this vote I was taunted throughout the State by the law and order gang, and yet when the count came who was seen to have pocketed the vote?

The primary was intended for the free expression of the white Democratic voters' wishes as to who should be their candidate. It was intended to make easy and afford facility for the free expression of their will, and not intended to circumscribe their right, and certainly not substantially to destroy it. These rules and the machinery inaugurated under them and the effort given to them were intended to hamper and make inconvenient this expression of the will of the white Democrats, especially the very people that the party should have protected and aided in the exercise of their manhood suffrage. I was aware, at the beginning, of this purpose and intention upon the part of my opponents. I forecasted it upon all occasions—that the machinery of conducting this election was taken out of your hands, my adherents, friends and supporters, and placed wholly within the hands of my adversaries and bitter opponents.

While I believe, and even knew, so far as one could know, that I would receive a majority of the ballots cast for the office for which I was running, I insisted that unless the vote which was cast was safeguarded and the true returns made and a proper count had, that I would not be declared the nominee. I implored my friends to see that the ballots were counted. Unfortunately it now appears from advices that I have had from all sources that too much reliance was placed upon perfidious adversaries.

I felt no apprehension from any of the attacks made by the two men who came into the race and made their entire campaign one of abuse. Their position was peculiar. They declared that Senator Smith was not entitled to be re-elected to the office of Senator; that his claim for re-election, in the light of his actions in the Senate, did not entitle him to succeed himself, and that his pretensions were without foundation. At the same time, if I was unfit, and Senator Smith was not fit, whom then should

the people elect out of the four that were running? These two? It necessarily followed that one of these two should be elected if they were right. Could the people in one breath declare that Smith was not entitled by any action or service that he had rendered to the people to be again their Senator and yet vote for him? No, they had no confidence in these two men and the result of the vote showed it. I did not recognize them as candidates or worthy of notice as such. It was a question entirely between myself and Senator Smith, and three weeks before the election who can say, after knowing the result of the meetings which we had in all parts of the State, that I would not beat him in the race by what I then claimed—by 8,000 to 11,000 majority? I do not shut my eyes to the fact, nor do I care to pass it over without acknowledging it as a fact, that the commotion which was stirred up by the bankers and the manufacturers in the name of the cotton planters of this State was seized upon by Senator Smith and his friends to persuade the farmers of the necessity of his election to the United States Senate to aid them in certain pretended anticipated actions that the administration of President Wilson would take in their behalf, and that the failure to elect him would be met with serious resentment by the administration, and harm and injury would result to the farmers. Then, too, it was argued that those who were greedy for office would fail of obtaining appointment and enjoying the spoils which an administration could give and confer upon those who would cast their votes and use their influence in behalf of candidates who had obtained by servile actions and ready obedience the good will of the departments of the Federal government. I have no censure for the farmers of this State. I simply say they have been deluded and betrayed and it will not be long before they recognize the fact and feel that they should have stood by me in this election and resented this attempt to deceive them. But even with this change I still undoubtedly would have been elected had an honest count been made throughout the State and an honest election held in two of the largest cities of the State.

As I have said, I feared nothing from the misrepresentations of the two would-be candidates. I paid very little attention to what they said. The record had been made up and was accessible to all. Their principal cry was raised against the power vested in the Governor by the Constitution of the State to see

that the laws are executed in mercy. Exercising this onerous, but most obligatory, duty I have exercised mercy. I have endeavored to see that the laws of the State are not heartlessly and cruelly enforced, and I have followed, as any one who has the slightest knowledge upon the subject knows, the same principles now prevalent in most all of our States which have abrogated the cruel and barbaric treatment of prisoners; and yet a candidate for the United States Senate, obeying the duties of his office, exercising the mandates of humanity, has been "exposed" for the first time, I believe, for the exercise of a generous heart and a merciful nature to criticism foul and unjust. I do not recall at present any other instance, except that of the Roman Governor, who found no fault in Him of Divine Nature, and yet was compelled by the clamors of the cruel and unmerciful to pass a sentence which from that day to this has been condemned in all Christian lands. But, if I mistake not, none has been so vile as to charge the Executive in the exercise of this merciful attribute, with which the Constitution clothes him, with having been influenced by corrupt purpose or illegal gain. If I am mistaken let me now demand that such wretch now make known his charge in such certain and specific way as when I shall call for judicial investigation against him that he may not by cowardly evasion attempt to escape the punishment which he justly deserves.

There was another matter which was dinged into the ears of the people and which the public may now with calmness look at in its true light. The misrepresentations of me in this matter were vile, but York county, the home of the subject of this discussion, showed by her vote how she estimated the dirty charges made against me. I received in that county 2,054 votes, Jennings received 59, Pollock received 21, and Smith received 1,905. As to the man making these charges, the estimate in which the people of his own county held him, and the estimate which they put upon the truthfulness of his charges, whatever they were, is seen by the vote which I received in his county, which was as follows: Chesterfield county—Blease, 1,338; Jennings, 28; Pollock, 413; Smith, 1,329.

The election has been declared. As the Executive Committee counted it Senator Smith received 72,266, I received 56,913, Jennings received 2,258, Pollock received 1,364. I shall not be insincere in saying that this has been a fair count or a true

result. I carefully considered before the meeting of the Executive Committee the condition which presented itself. I was unable, without adequate funds, to employ attorneys and pay for witnesses to conduct an extensive investigation or a recount, under a protest in this way, before a committee already pledged to defeat me. I felt then, as I feel now, that the strife of the campaign should end and that it was my duty to lend my efforts to that result. It is better for me to be defeated than for my people to undergo months of factional fight, crimination and recrimination, and an expose of the manner in which these ballot boxes have been handled. I acquiesce in the election. I shall vote for Senator Smith. I shall stand by the nominees made in these primaries. But I now assert that it is manifest that the primary system as conducted in 1912 and 1914 by the people who have been in charge of its management cannot survive—that it cannot survive unless these iniquitous, unjust and unfair rules shall be repealed; unless those whom they opprobriously call the “lower order” in our State be encouraged to vote in the primary instead of being deterred; unless they be fairly treated, and honest men be found to conduct the counting of the ballots cast at the polls and honest men to see that such an honest count is properly tabulated by the State Executive Committee. I deem it a pride that I have always maintained that the primary system is the one that we should uphold and keep. I have never, and will not now, raise my hand or voice to defeat its present results. But I warn the people of South Carolina that the patience of the true majority of the manhood of South Carolina will very little longer stand the treatment which they have received.

To you, my friends, I have said that my political ambition was gratified four years ago. I have never had any special desire of any further advancement in political life except to serve those whose opinions, whose rights and interests I represent, and by whom I have stood through storm and sunshine. They say that Bleaseism is dead. Blease is defeated for the office that he ran for, in the manner above described, but Bleaseism is not dead. What is Bleaseism? Every message that I have sent to the Legislatures since I have been Governor, which bodies were under the control of my opponents, has been in the interest and for the betterment of the poorer classes of our people and the adjustment upon equity and fairness of the rights between them

and their richer and more fortunate fellows. I have as Governor maintained the rights of the poor man to an equality with those of the rich man in the exercise of all the duties and obligations in the life of the citizen. I have worked and struggled that the poor white man of South Carolina shall have the same voice in government as the rich man—as the banker, the capitalist, the president of the mill, and the railroad officers; that when it comes to voting for office that the section man and railroad operative, who toils day by day for the support of his family, shall have the same right to vote for whomsoever he pleases as the president of the road who rides in his private car surrounded by his subordinates obeying his beck and call; that the clerk in the banking house, when he goes to the polls to cast his vote, shall be as uninfluenced in his choice as to who shall govern him as the president of the bank who touches his bells and rings into his presence the outdoor messenger or indoor clerk, and that the mill operatives who toil by day and by night shall have proper protection against the undue influence of officers and owners of mills.

Now, what has anti-Bleasism been? Look at the records of the Legislatures. Did they initiate any laws for the poor man? Has anything been passed which can be otherwise known than as oppression of the masses and the protection of the rich and of capital? Did they pass laws to help the laboring classes? Have they seen that the corporations of this State have fulfilled even the statutory requirements in their conduct towards the public? Have they seen that freight rates and passenger rates and freight accommodations and passenger accommodations have been carried out? I know of no such laws. Anti-Bleasism is, therefore, nothing but the perpetuation of the rule of the corporations and the rich over the poor; the denial of salutary laws for the health, safety and protection of those who cannot protect themselves. It is the indignation of the press against any interference with their opinions or with their recommendations of candidates for office or their control of the creature whom they have helped put in office.

These are the forces I have fought. These are the forces I will continue to fight, whether I bear the standard of the people that I represent or whether I stand as an humble helper in advancing their cause. The truth of this situation, like all other truths, will at last prevail. As for my future I shall endeavor,

like those whom I have loved, whom I have fought for, whom I have represented, to make a living out of my profession, or as best I can. But whatever be my fortune, I say to you, my friends and supporters, I thank you for the favor you have shown me; I thank you for the encouragement you have given me, and I trust that you will always consider that I am ever ready to donate whatever is in my power of effort or of speech to stand by you to the end.

Very respectfully,

COLE. L. BLEASE.

COTTON CONVENTIONS.

A convention was held in the Jefferson Hotel in the city of Columbia and people were told and the farmers were implored not to sell a pound of cotton for less than 12 cents, and the farmers were appealed to everywhere to save the day by holding for 12 cent cotton. But all at once some of the very promoters of this convention began to cry, "Buy a bale at ten cents," directly in conflict with what this convention had just advised the farmers to do. Why this sudden change and shift of position? They were appealing to the farmer to hold for 12 cents. Why should they so suddenly call on the farmer to sell and the other fellow to buy a bale at ten cents? It simply shows that they were not considering the interest of the farmer. Their interest was in the purchaser, as you all know, and I know, that every man who is able to buy a bale of cotton and hold it will make a profit. Why not tell the farmer, "No, farmer, do not sell your bale of cotton; hold it, and if you find that you are unable to hold it we will lend you money on it at ten cents a pound and let you make the profit?" That would have been in the interest of the farmer—of the poor farmer. But no, this crowd's interest was in the man who had the money to buy, and not in the poor fellow who had the cotton to sell. That is why they shifted positions and began to holler, "Buy a bale," deceiving the poor farmer in the effort to make a profit for those able to buy—a profit made on the temporary misfortune of the poor man.

Then comes a letter to me from one Dr. Wade Stackhouse, styling himself president South Carolina Division, Southern Cotton Congress, as follows:

STACKHOUSE LETTER.

SOUTHERN COTTON CONGRESS,
Dillon, S. C., Sept. 2, 1914.

Dear Sir: At a meeting of the South Carolina Division of the Southern Cotton Congress, held in Columbia, S. C., September 1st, the following resolution was passed:

Whereas, More than a 15,000,000 bale cotton crop is assured in the South this year, which, on account of the European war, is five or six million bales more than the spinners of the world will take; and,

Whereas, On account of this overabundant supply and the enormous surplus which will have to be carried over by the farmer or his friends to September, 1915, or later, causing the price of cotton to drop several cents per pound below the cost of production; be it

Resolved, That we urge a meeting of all of the Governors of the cotton States, to be held at some convenient point as early as possible, and that they consider at this meeting calling a special session of their several Legislatures for the purpose of limiting by legislation the crop of 1915.

We believe that no voluntary agreement made by the farmers of the South will be sufficiently binding to eliminate the surplus of this crop and give value to the next crop, and that nothing short of government control of acreage will prevent the impending financial ruin now apparent.

Respectfully,

WADE STACKHOUSE,

WS—p.

President South Carolina Div.

Next comes a convention held in the Governor's office, attended by representative farmers, business men and professional men from different sections of the State, when the following resolutions were passed:

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS.

Columbia, S. C., September 2, 1914.

A meeting of farmers, and those interested in farming interests, was called by Governor Blease, in his office, at 12 o'clock, noon, on Wednesday. By special request of the Governor, Major John G. Richards was called from his campaign in the Piedmont section of the State to attend this conference and to advise with those called in

consultation, Major Richards himself being a prominent member for many years of the Cotton Association and Farmers' Union, and for several years representing and fighting for the farmers on the floor of the House of Representatives.

In attendance upon this conference were representatives from Abbeville, Anderson, Aiken, Barnwell, Beaufort, Berkeley, Charleston, Cherokee, Colleton, Darlington, Dillon, Edgefield, Fairfield, Florence, Georgetown, Greenwood, Kershaw, Lancaster, Laurens, Lee, Lexington, Marlboro, Marion, Newberry, Orangeburg, Richland, Saluda, Pickens, Sumter, Spartanburg, Union, Williamsburg and York counties. These gentlemen were present to discuss some manner by which the farmers, the share croppers, the tenants and the renters of South Carolina could be relieved in the present financial crisis.

After a full and free discussion, Major John G. Richards offered the following resolution:

"Whereas, It is admitted and realized among the money-borrowing element of our State and the farmers who are entirely dependent for the support of themselves, their wives and children, upon their cotton crop; and,

"Whereas, It has been admitted by those high in authority that no relief can be expected from the National government in the present crisis; and,

"Whereas, It is realized by all citizens of our State, of whatever class or profession, that the only source from which real relief can come is the General Assembly of our State, and that said General Assembly can only be placed in a position to render such relief, by action of the Governor of the State; be it

"Resolved, That the Governor of South Carolina be, and he is hereby, requested to call a special session of the General Assembly, to be convened at such date as in his judgment will bring forth the needed relief through legislation, and that said Legislature, when it convenes, be requested to pass, regardless of factional politics:

"First. A Bill such as in their judgment is wise and expedient for the extension of all indebtedness for such period as may be calculated to insure sure relief to the debtors of this State.

"Second. A Bill, under the police powers of the Constitution, restricting the acreage in cotton throughout the State, for the year 1915.

"Third. That said Legislature be further requested to pass at said extra session only such legislation as will give immediate relief to the

cotton producers of this State, and that said extra session of the Legislature is particularly requested to deal only with such questions as are of vital importance to the people of this State at this time.

"Fourth. That the members of the said General Assembly, when they meet in said special session, be requested to pass a Bill giving to themselves sufficient compensation to pay themselves for the actual expenses incident to their attending said session, and that they be requested not to claim as pay for said session the regular salary as provided for regular sessions of the General Assembly, under the Constitution and statute laws of our State.

"Fifth. That the Attorney General be requested to call only to his assistance in said extra session, not more than three of the Solicitors of this State, and that he employ not exceeding six Clerks for the Engrossing Department during said session.

"Respectfully,

"JOHN G. RICHARDS,

"W. A. STUCKEY,

"JAMES NORTON,

"Committee."

I answered Dr. Stackhouse's letter as follows:

REPLY TO STACKHOUSE LETTER.

State of South Carolina, Executive Department.

Columbia, S. C., September 4, 1914.

Wade Stackhouse, President South Carolina Division, Southern Cotton Congress, Dillon, S. C.:

Preamble and resolution, dated Dillon, S. C., September 2, and signed by yourself, received at the Governor's office this day.

In the campaign for the United States Senate, just closed, it was said throughout the State by opponents of mine, that if Senator Smith was re-elected, the United States government would come to the immediate relief of the farmers, under the new Currency Act, and would let them have a sufficient amount of money to market the cotton of the South. As I understand your movement, it is an effort to hold the cotton by putting it in warehouses. It seems to me, therefore, that the two movements are in direct conflict. How can you both hold the cotton and market it at the same time? I think the proper thing for your association to do would be to call upon Senator Smith, and those who were backing him, to fulfill

their campaign promises to the people of the State and relieve this situation at once by raising the price of cotton and by making proper arrangements to finance the crop, or to come out and admit that this argument was used as buncombe to fool the farmers into voting for Smith. I said on the stump that this was the purpose, and it is now shown to be absolutely true. Senator Smith has been renominated, the price of cotton goes lower, and the farmers receive no relief.

I notice in an article published in the newspapers this morning, that you state that the resolutions passed at the Jefferson Hotel Conference were practically the same as those passed at the conference in the Governor's office, when Major John G. Richards introduced his resolution. If you will read both, you will see that you are very much mistaken. Major Richards' resolutions cover a great deal that your resolutions very adroitly dodge. You will please read Major Richards' resolutions, and tell me which set of resolutions you favor, and which one of them you do not favor, as president of your association, and please make special note as to whether you favor a stay law, to be passed by the General Assembly, which will save the poor farmers of this State from having their little crops, mules and horses, and in some instances their lands, that are now under mortgages, from being forced upon the market and sold this fall by the bankers and merchants while this financial crisis is upon us. Do you favor such a law, or are you in favor of allowing these rich people to force the property of these poor people upon the block, under mortgage, and turn them and their families out of a home?

You will also please state whether your association and yourself favor the State warehouse system.

I notice in your interview this morning, that you state you have no candidate for Governor, and that you want no factional politics. Possibly this is true, but will you please explain to me why it is that nearly every one of your State and county association officials are what are commonly called in this State anti-Blease men, and that nearly every one of them are corporation officeholders or corporation stockholders, and that their own financial interests are more largely connected with corporations than with the farmers? You will also please state whether it is a fact that you yourself and nearly all your officers are for Mr. Manning for Governor—a man who is the president of a bank and stockholder in other corporations—against Mr. John G. Richards, who is a simon-pure farmer and a member of your association. You know, and all your associates know, that your whole organization is a partisan political machine,

and was used all the way through the recent campaign to help Senator Smith in his re-election, you yourself advocating Senator Smith openly, and not only you yourself, but your colleagues—Parker, the head of the cotton mill merger; Shannon, president of the State Bankers' Association; your cousin, T. B. Stackhouse, of Ed Robertson's bank, and nearly every other man in your association—hollering for Smith and telling the farmers that the re-election of Smith was their salvation. Do you call that partisan politics? If your organization is not a partisan, political organization, why was not the present Governor of South Carolina invited to some of your conferences and asked to confer with you? Why were your doors always shut to him, and why do you have to speak to him through resolutions passed at a gathering to which he was not invited?

I notice also that you say in your article that you condemn the effort of the Governor to inject politics into a matter of such serious import. I care nothing for your condemnation, sir, and neither do I care anything for your support. I have not offered to inject politics into this matter, nor did Major Richards know that I was going to give out any interview upon the subject, or connect his name with it, and he is in no manner or form responsible for what I said. I know of no better way to obtain the opinion of a majority of the people of my State as to whether or not they want a special session of the Legislature than for them to express it at the ballot box. I am their servant, and will do as they ask. Those who favor the Richards resolution will cast their votes for him next Tuesday. Those who do not, like yourself, will vote against him—and you would vote against him, and your crowd would vote against him, if you knew his election would raise the price of cotton to twenty cents a pound and make every poor farmer in South Carolina independent—and you know it.

My interview was no threat. Any man who will read it and look at it from a nonpartisan standpoint will see that it is merely a fair, clear statement, and I shall be governed by it.

As to your resolutions, I desire to state that I shall not attend any conference of the Governors of the cotton growing States, nor shall I be governed in my actions in this matter by you or your associates, because it would give you great delight to lead me into some political trap or snare, and cause me to injure myself with the people of this State. I shall be governed in this matter by the people, whose servant I am, and after next Tuesday I can give you, or any other man that wants to know, a definite answer as to what I shall do in refer-

ence to the calling of the extra session of the General Assembly for any purpose.

I would not have answered your resolutions, or paid any attention to you personally, as I think your interview clearly makes you entirely unworthy of any reply in the matter from this office, but as president of the partisan, political, factional association that you represent, I address you this communication. It is very strange that you and your crowd always holler partisan politics at anything I or my friends happen to do, but you run your whole organization to elect your men, and of course it is "nonpolitical." You and your crowd may fool some people, but you most assuredly do not deceive or fool me. I know your number and am keeping a careful watch on your acts, and the day will come, and it will be here in a very short time, that will prove to the laboring element of this State who told them the truth in the recent campaign, and who is their real, true friend, and when that day arrives, at their next opportunity they will reverse the verdict that they rendered on the 25th of August.

Personally, my life-ambition was to be Governor. I have been and I am Governor. But I dislike to see the people of this State put in the hands—particularly in their financial matters—of such men as you and your association—Lewis Parker, Ed Robertson, T. B. Stackhouse, Shannon, and other bankers, who are claiming to help the farmers, when you know at heart you and they are working for your own selfish interests and care nothing for the poor man, as I am satisfied the people of Dillon would testify if they were called upon at the ballot box to pass upon your popularity in your home county.

COLE. L. BLEASE, Governor.

OTHER REQUESTS FOR EXTRA SESSION.

I received personal requests from members of both the House and the Senate, and written requests from members of both bodies, and particularly many true friends of the laboring man—not political mountebanks, but friends—requesting an extra session of the General Assembly. Following this, the proclamation already mentioned was issued, and on the next day the following interview was given to the press:

INTERVIEW ON ISSUING PROCLAMATION FOR EXTRA SESSION.

I stated to the *News and Courier* correspondent last night, when I gave him the proclamation calling for an extra session of the Legislature, that I did not have the opportunity then to prepare a statement of my views in reference to the extra session, but that I would give them to him this morning. I did make a few remarks to him, as he states, among them that I was not inclined to agree that a stay law of some kind or form could not be legally enacted. My reasons for calling the extra session of the General Assembly are clearly and fully set forth in the proclamation. I shall, of course, when the Legislature is convened, send them a short message, giving to them such suggestions as I think are proper, and then leave it with them to enact such laws as they deem wise.

I think, however, that one of the very first things that they should do, would be to appoint a nonfactional committee to confer with a similar committee from the Legislatures of other cotton growing States, as to what is best to do in reference to the cotton situation, so as to get together upon a proper and uniform law, that the benefits derived from it will be given to all of the cotton growing people and approved by the Governors of the cotton growing States.

Now, individually, I am of the opinion that they should pass a law protecting the poor people of the State from being imposed upon by the foreclosure of either personal or real estate mortgages during this panic. I am satisfied that such a law can be passed, as will meet every constitutional requirement. They may not call it a stay law, but it most assuredly can be termed a law for the protection of the majority of the citizens of the State.

I also think that they should pass a law to reduce the rate of interest in this State, and to make it a felony, punishable by a long term of imprisonment, without the alternative of a fine, for any person, association or corporation, to charge any money borrower, either by discount or otherwise, any greater rate of interest than that fixed in the Bill, so as to stop the usury, or, you might more properly say, robbery of the man who is compelled to have a little money.

I think they should also take up and give their most careful and serious consideration a State warehouse system,—either such Bill as was introduced at the last session, or such Bill as will give the farmers proper relief.

And, yet, the most important of all matters to be considered, as I see it, is to make arrangements to finance the State during this crisis, without issuing executions against the property of the individual citizens who will not be able to meet his tax obligations this fall. The present administration borrowed all the money it wanted this year—sufficient amount to run it—at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., in the face of all the cursing, abuse and villification and the lies that have been told on the present Governor, and with the bankers, money interests, all fighting him and trying to hamper his administration in order to cause his defeat. It certainly would seem then that the incoming administration, with a very, very wealthy bank president at its head, endorsed by all the money interests of the State, including capitalists, bankers, railroad officials, cotton mill presidents and others, surely should be able to borrow money as cheaply, if not much cheaper, than the retiring administration,—and, in view of this fact, I heartily favor the extension of the time for the payment of taxes in order to protect the property of the poor and helpless.

The people are the State and each individual, however poor he may be, is as much a part of his State as the wealthiest man in it, and should receive the same protection from its laws;—in my opinion, it is a great deal better for the State as a whole to be in debt than it is for the individual to have every little thing he has forced upon the market and his wife and children turned out of home; and, as the State has borrowed this year all the money she wants at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and no individual can borrow money at all, or if so, for not less than eight or ten per cent., therefore, it is better for all of the individuals, *AS ONE*, called the State, to borrow money to run the government on until April 1st, at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., or even at 5 per cent., than to force the one individual citizen to mortgage all he has to borrow money at eight or ten per cent., in order to pay his *pro rata* share of the running expenses of the government, of which government he is one. I have repeatedly called the attention of the Legislature to the fact that extravagant appropriations made extravagant levies, and if the Legislature had listened to me at its last session, and sustained all my vetoes, the levy this year could have been much less than it is; however, it is too late now to discuss that situation. We must discuss the one that faces us. There is many a poor man who will not be able to pay his taxes this fall—in fact, he will not be able to pay for what he and his family have already necessarily had to consume in order to sustain life, and will have a hard time to make arrangements to continue to get the necessities of life under

the present financial panic; and, it most assuredly would be unjust, unfair and tyrannical for the whole to say to the one, we will take your property and force it on the market and force your wife and children out in the street, if you do not pay your taxes by a certain date, particularly when the whole knows that it is impossible for the one, the individual, to make such arrangements, or, if he does make it, to do so by the payment of an exorbitant profit to the money-lender. To illustrate—suppose a corporation is composed of ten men and they owe \$100,000,—each being required to pay in \$10,000. If the corporation could borrow the amount needed at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and no individual could borrow his \$10,000 for less than 10 per cent. by mortgaging all he had, would it not be better for the corporation, as a whole, to borrow the \$100,000 than for each individual to be forced to borrow his \$10,000? Anyone will answer, “Yes,” for the individuals make the corporation. Just so with the State, it is much cheaper for the State, as a whole, to borrow the amount needed to run the government, than it is to force each individual to pay an exorbitant rate of interest, by mortgaging all of his property to pay his *pro rata* share; and, as with the corporation, the individual makes the great corporation—namely, the State.

As I stated in my inaugural address, in 1910, which I repeat now—it is far better to have a poor government and a wealthy people, than it is to have a wealthy government and a poor people. If our General Assembly had listened to me then, and acted upon that presumption, which is absolutely true, our people would not be as closely pinched as we are in the present crisis; but the Legislature, being overwhelmingly opposed to me, carried out its usual policies and showed to the world that anti-Bleaseism was the oppression of the poor, while Bleaseism was then, as it is today, the refuge of the poor and the oppressed.

COLE. L. BLEASE.

September 11, 1914.

I stated in this interview that it certainly would seem that the incoming administration, with a very wealthy bank president at its head, should be able to borrow money as cheaply, if not cheaper, than the retiring administration. Since giving out this interview, I think my idea of extending the time for the payment of taxes has been wonderfully vindicated, and that the State would certainly have no trouble now in getting all of the money that it wants, and at a very low rate of interest. I beg to quote you the following:

McADOO WILL TRY TO GET LOAN FOR STATE OF TENNESSEE.

“(Associated Press Dispatch.)

“Washington, September 24.—In connection with the alleged refusal of National banks to extend credits Secretary McAdoo today issued this statement:

“Senator Lea, of Tennessee, informs me that the State of Tennessee has \$1,600,000 of short term notes, maturing October 1; that the State desires to renew or extend \$1,400,000 of these notes; that a commission representing the State has been in New York for some time trying to effect this loan, but without success.

“It is preposterous that one of the great States of the Union should find it impossible to procure from the banks such a comparatively small amount of money. Senator Lea informs me that he was going to New York last night for the purpose of joining the commission in its efforts to secure the needed loan.

“If Senator Lea and his associates are unable to procure from banks in the city of New York or elsewhere today and upon reasonable terms, the desired loan, I will myself see if banks can not be found to take up this loan for the State of Tennessee on the first of October next, upon reasonable terms and at a reasonable rate of interest.”

Most assuredly Senators Smith and Tillman and the then Governor can easily get whatever money they want through Mr. McAdoo. You may ask why. The answer is, Because it seems if Mr. McAdoo could arrange a loan for the Republican administration of Tennessee, surely he would arrange one for the Democratic administration of South Carolina.

A SERIOUS CONDITION CONFRONTS US.

You will see, therefore, gentlemen, that this is a serious condition that confronts us, and that no child's play will work its solution.

The Democratic party of this nation needs wise counsellors and cautious action. We have recently heard it said that a great victory had been won in Maine for the Democratic party. That is where some of our great leaders are being seriously deceived. Maine re-elected every one of her Congressmen, three-fourths of them being Republicans. She has elected a Republican Assembly. The only victory for the Democrats was a Democratic Governor, and that was no victory for Democracy—it was a victory for whiskey,

which most assuredly the present National Administration would not call a victory for itself. As a matter of fact, the Maine election was thus: Mr. Curtis was Mayor of the city of Portland, and a Democrat. He favored local option as against prohibition. The Republican candidate, the present Governor, was a Prohibitionist, and had been very strict in the enforcement of the Prohibition law, and had his officials right in the city of Portland to raid and close up places where whiskey or beer was used—even the locker clubs—and this had lost him many supporters among those who had had in the administration previous, the privilege of having their beer and wines in their clubrooms. And when the election came, men who had never voted a Democratic ticket before voted for Mayor Curtis to be Governor, not because he was a Democrat, but as a rebuke to the then Governor for having taken their beer and whiskey out of their lockers and refused to give it back to them. In addition to this, personal friendship and city pride got for Mr. Curtis many votes in Portland because they wanted to see their Mayor and their personal friend made Governor, regardless of whether he might be a Democrat or a Republican.

So you will see that the Democratic party needs to be warned. I tell you, gentlemen, that she is today in serious danger, and that if the November elections are not carefully watched and guarded, the next House will be Republican, and not Democratic.

Therefore, I urge you not to depend upon outside help, but let us help ourselves.

Right here I want to quote from an article by William E. Gonzales—this from the editor of the paper who held out in his editorial columns to the farmers of this State, as an inducement for the re-election of Senator Smith, that the National government would take care of the situation if Senator Smith was re-elected—this from the editor of the paper, who, when the present Governor of South Carolina spoke of the inability of the National administration to do the very thing which this editor now says they cannot do, came out in an editorial and stated that the Governor was criticising the National administration and was not in harmony with it. Was this paper deceiving the people then, or did those high in authority deceive this editor? One or the other is compelled to be true, for surely the Governor in his warning to the people prophesied exactly what has taken place, as now admitted by this Minister to Cuba, who, we presume, speaks *ex cathedra* for his President:

GONZALES' ARTICLE.

"It is frequently unpopular to dispel illusions, but my concern for the welfare of the Southern cotton grower is so great and my understanding that only prompt measures for his assistance can be beneficial is so clear that I must speak against an illusion.

"Every hour that our people wait inactive, in the hope that the general government will purchase and retire the 5,000,000, 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 bales of cotton in excess of the demand for manufacture is an hour lost. Every effort to get the government to do that thing is effort wasted, and this is no time for the South to waste effort."

There is almost the exact language used by me on the public rostrum in the campaign last summer. It was true then, and is yet, and those who were attempting to, and did, deceive some of our people knew it, but were willing to use false hopes as bait to catch votes.

I beg leave to call your further attention to an editorial from *The News and Courier*, September 24, 1914, as follows:

A FUTILE SUGGESTION.

"It is evident that the proposal to have Congress pass a law the effect of which would be to curtail the size of next year's cotton crop has taken pretty strong hold upon the imagination of many Southerners. There is, of course, not the ghost of a chance that Congress will do anything of the sort, and it is a pity that such empty hopes as this should be raised in the breasts of a distressed people.

"The powers of Congress are very great, but great as they are, and vastly enlarged as has become the authority centered in Washington, there are some limitations to these powers and this authority. It is a strange spectacle to see men who either fought under the Stars and Bars themselves or, whose fathers did so clamoring less than fifty years afterwards to have the Federal government come down and regulate their conduct of their own plantations.

"If this were practicable and Congress should respond to such an appeal most of those who joined in it would probably live to repent that such a precedent had ever been set. But Congress has no such power, so far as anybody has yet been able to show, and even if it had we may be sure that the rest of the country

would never become a party to legislation of the kind proposed. The North and West sympathize with the South in her present misfortune, but their people would no more stand for a law arbitrarily raising the price of cotton, a necessity of life, than our people would stand for such a law arbitrarily raising the price of wheat, another such necessity.

"It may be that the State governments have the power to pass such laws and that, by acting in concert, they could practically forbid the planting of more than a third or a half of the normal cotton acreage. There are some lawyers who argue that a law of this sort might be written into the statute books of South Carolina, its form being that of a prohibitive tax upon all cotton produced above a given amount. The proposition is doubtful at best, but even if it stood the test of the Courts, could it be put into successful operation? We don't believe it. Certainly no plan has been suggested which could not easily be evaded by those who wished to do so.

"The necessity that less cotton, and very much less cotton, be planted in 1915 is so obvious as to call for no argument. But it is futile to depend upon legislation for the curtailment which it is desired to effect. The best assurance of a reduced cotton crop next year is to be found in the growing realization on the part of the farmers that until this war is over and industry has been rehabilitated cotton is likely to prove a profitless crop. The farmers are ready to turn to other crops. What they need more than anything else is sound advice as to what to do and how to do it in order to make their lands yield them a living until such time as cotton once more becomes a safe 'money crop.'

"Too much is at stake to have the people imagining vain things."

EDITORS.

Here are the editors of your two leading papers presenting their post-election views. Or were these their views and known to them during the election? If so, why did they attempt to deceive the people and not give them this very important information? Why were these editorials not written three weeks earlier? Oh, no! that would have ruined their political candidates. How can our people be expected to have confidence in the editors of papers when they are compelled to conclude, by a comparison of their before- and after-election editorials, that they either falsify or conceal the truth?

THE INCOMING STATE ADMINISTRATION.

The incoming administration cannot be looked to to help the poor man and the laboring man. He who is to become the Chief Executive has the following record :

Manning voted in 1902, as Senator, when a bill was introduced to prohibit trusts, against the bill and for the trusts. See Senate Journal, 1902, pages 462 and 472. At the same session, when the railroad relief bill for employees was offered, he voted to kill the bill and against the interests of the employees. See Journal, pages 262, 276 and 504. By voting to kill this bill he voted to prevent the family of the railroad employee who was killed by negligence of the railroad, or its servants, from recovering any damages from the railroad corporation. At the same session, when the State was endeavoring to repeal the charter of the Virginia-Carolina Chemical Company, a trust throttling, or attempting to throttle, the farmers of South Carolina, and which Attorney General Bellinger and his assistants were fighting with all their power, Mr. Manning voted against the bill to suspend this corporation and against the interests of the farmers and laboring people. See Journal, 1902, page 360. In the session of 1900, Journal, page 206, you will see where Mr. Manning voted against the child labor bill and against the interest of the cotton mill employees. In 1905, as Senator, he voted against the bill to prevent strikes and lockouts, which was introduced to meet emergencies and to help the cotton mill employees, thus voting against the laboring man and in favor of the corporation. He also voted against the bill for ten hours in cotton mills. You will find that in the session of 1893, House Journal, page 186. Also in the Senate Journal of 1900, page 365, he voted against separate coaches for the two races, thus voting for white ladies to be thrown in the same coaches with negro men.

It will thus be seen that this man, who is now the president of a bank in Sumter and a director in many other large corporations in this State, on every occasion, as Senator and Representative, voted against the interests of the laboring man and for the corporations, and he is today the candidate of the corporations and their officers and attorneys, and is receiving their unanimous and solid backing.

In addition to this, he was in the Sheppard convention, which met in March, 1892, as a delegate from Sumter county, which

convention denounced Ben Tillman's administration in these words: "We pledge ourselves to the most rigid economy in the administration of the government, made more than necessary by the misfortunes of the people and the impending deficiency in our treasury, resulting from the unwise management of the present administration." At another place, in speaking of the then Governor B. R. Tillman, their platform said: "We submit that the course of the head of our present administration, both before and since his election, has been unwise and unjust." And this platform goes on—it is too long for me to quote it all to you—in denouncing Tillman and the reform movement in no uncertain language, and calling upon the people to rally around their standard, carried by John C. Sheppard, of Edgefield, to down the "despot" Tillman and his friends.

Now, Mr. Manning claims to be a friend of the farmer and the laboring people. If so, why was he in this convention denouncing Tillman and the farmers' movements in such terms as I have quoted to you, and as can easily be verified by the records?

Mr. Manning, when he was Senator from Sumter county in 1902, voted to compel all parents or guardians to send their children or wards to school, a bill known as the compulsory education bill, introduced by Senator Raysor, of Orangeburg. Mr. Brice, the Senator from York, moved to kill the bill. Mr. Manning voted "No," thus voting for compulsory education. Now he says he favors local option for compulsory education because the people as a whole are not ready for compulsory education. Yet twelve years ago, when they were very much less ready then than they are now, he did not vote for local option compulsory education, nor did he vote to leave it to the people whether they wanted it or not, but he voted to force it on them. Another artful change in this corporation candidate's political life.

He is most assuredly subject to change, for he was one of the State dispensary's most bitter and active opponents when a member of the Senate, but after going to Washington and holding a conference with Senator Tillman he came back to the Senate and all at once became the great champion of the corrupt (?) dispensary, falling on his knees and hollering, in order to become Governor, "I am now a friend of the State dispensary; I am now a friend of Ben Tillman, whom I have denounced publicly and privately; I am now a disciple of Tillmanism, and an

upholder of the dispensary," concluding with those beautiful lines:

"I now consecrate my all to thee,
Ben Tillman and the State dispensarcee."

When Mr. Manning was a member of the House of Representatives in 1893 a bill was introduced to change the legal rate of interest in this State by reducing it, which was a bill in favor of the money borrower, the poor man. When a motion was made to kill the bill Mr. Manning voted to kill it, and against reducing the rate of interest which the banks were receiving from the poor man. Thus again he shows his interest in behalf of the corporations—he being a corporation director and a corporation president—by refusing to vote to reduce the rate of interest, which would have been of great assistance to the poor people—those who have to borrow money. This will be found on page 334 of the House Journal of 1893.

THE LEGISLATURE.

If you will look over the list of members elected to the Senate and House you will find that quite a large number of them—I believe the majority—are officers, attorneys, stockholders or servants of corporations, just as the man who has been nominated for Governor is, and of course to them the people as a whole need not look for much relief, either through lower taxation, reduction of expenses or a smaller appropriation bill.

However, personally, I have no criticism to make. The voters were thoroughly warned, and whether these people were elected by fair or false methods they have been declared the nominees of the Democratic party, and we all, as loyal Democrats, must support them. Whenever you play at the other fellow's game and get bit, never squeal, for when you start to play at his game you must at once realize that he has the advantage, and that he could not keep playing the game if he did not win. If you lose, simply smile.

IT, THEREFORE, BEHOOVES YOU, THE PRESENT LEGISLATURE, TO PASS IMMEDIATELY SUCH LAWS AS WILL GIVE RELIEF, FOR FROM NO OTHER SOURCE CAN RELIEF BE EXPECTED, AND FROM NO OTHER SOURCE WILL IT COME UNTIL THE PEOPLE SHALL HAVE SPOKEN AGAIN.

AS TO THE LENGTH OF YOUR SESSION AND PAY OF MEMBERS.

It has been suggested to me, in fact, I have been requested, to limit your session to a certain number of days, your members to a certain amount of pay, and your actions to certain bills. As I see it, under our Constitution, the executive department is separate and distinct from the legislative, and even if it were not, the present Executive would certainly have no desire to interfere with your actions.

I cannot, and neither would I, if I could, restrict the length of your session. I leave that to your own good judgment and patriotism. Neither can I prescribe what you shall do or what you shall not do, or how long you shall stay in session, because the Constitution forbids my doing so, if I so desired, and I assure you that in this particular I have no criticism of the Constitution.

As to your pay, when a member of the Senate I made a hard and stubborn fight against the \$200 per session bill. My reasons were given then on the floor of the Senate, and I urged the very point which is now being made and asked that a proviso be inserted that in case of an extra session of the General Assembly that members be paid a per diem. But the matter was rushed through, the large majority voted contrary to my views, and the law was passed as it now is, and you are entitled to the same pay as you would be entitled to at a regular session. I argued this very contingency and begged the Senate at the time to fix it so that in case of an extra session, which might last for only a few days, the lump sum contemplated for a forty days' session would not be provided.

SUGGESTIONS.

Now, gentlemen, having placed fairly and fully before you these matters, pardon me for suggesting:

First. That you appoint a committee to confer with similar committees from the Legislatures of other cotton-growing States for the purpose of passing such laws as will relieve the present situation and prevent a recurrence of conditions as they are today.

Second. That you pass a law prohibiting the sale of any property, real or personal, under any lien or mortgage prior to the first day of October, one thousand nine hundred and fifteen, with

a proviso in the bill that if any creditor shall attempt to make way with his property, or to do it serious damage in order to decrease its value, that the provisions of this bill shall not apply to him.

Third. In accordance with the interview which I gave out, and which I have quoted to you as part of this message, that you pass an act extending the time for the payment of all taxes, city, county and State, for such period as in your judgment will be of most benefit to the taxpayers of your State, so that if a poor man who honestly and conscientiously does his best, but cannot pay his taxes, fails to do so, that his little personal property, or even his little home, may not be forced upon the block and sold and he and his wife and little children turned out into the street.

Fourth. That you pass an act reducing the legal rate of interest in this State to six per cent., and making the provisions of the act such as are mentioned in my interview herein quoted.

Fifth. That you give your most careful and serious consideration to the passage of a law for a reduction of the acreage in the planting of cotton. Personally, I do not care at this time to express an opinion as to the constitutionality of such a law, and of course it would hardly be beneficial to our people if we act alone, but if all the cotton-growing States would agree on a proposition of that kind, the fact that you had led off in it would be much to your credit. You, as legislators, can pass it, and let the Courts take the responsibility of nullifying your action.

Sixth. That you give your most careful and serious consideration to the passage of some Warehouse System Act. I seriously doubt, to be frank with you, though, the advisability of State control, and most assuredly could not and would not approve any bill that would place such a system in the hands of State officials as *ex officio* managers.

Seventh. That you pass an Act exempting from taxation for the year 1914 those of our fellow citizens in the counties of York and Laurens who suffered so much injury from the hailstorm during the past summer.

CONCLUSION.

Many of you possibly now realize that what I said in my veto message of the Appropriation Bill during the regular session of 1914 was much more of a true prophecy than you then had any



idea of. You will find these words in that message: "Those of you who are going to run for re-election have certainly got men at home now watching you who want your jobs, and the fact that you have raised this tax levy so fearfully high, and the fact that you have passed such an extravagant Appropriation Bill, is going to be put right square up to you, and some of you are going to find that instead of coming to Columbia next January, you will be performing your regular routine duties at home."

If you will pass the laws herein suggested, all of your people will rise up and call you blessed, and those of you who have been temporarily defeated, or cheated, can go back to your people and receive their heartfelt thanks, and if you so desire, receive at the next election their hearty support and have written upon your banners once again the word "Victory," for now, as then, he who made the prophecy represents the sentiments and the will of the majority of the white Democratic voters of this State.

Very respectfully,

COLE. L. BLEASE,

Governor.